

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
Bulletin

Volume 34

SUMMER 1948

Number 2

Editor

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD

Associate Editor

GEORGE POPE SHANNON

Editorial Committee

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND

LOUISE POUND

WILLIAM T. LAPRADE

RICHARD J. PURCELL

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Streets, Easton, Pa. *Editorial Office:* 1101 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Issued quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are \$3.50 a year. Entered as second-class matter April 24, 1922, at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

RALPH H. LUTZ (*History*) Stanford University

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

JOHN A. KINNEMAN (*Sociology*) Illinois State Normal University

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

MARIE J. WEISS (*Mathematics*) The Tulane University of Louisiana

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Government, Law*) Washington Office

ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

GEORGE POPE SHANNON (*English*) Washington Office

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

* TERM MEMBERS

1946-1948

ESTHER CRANE (<i>Education</i>)	Goucher College
JEREMIAH STANTON FINCH (<i>English, Public Speaking</i>)	Princeton University
PHILIP LAWRENCE HARRIMAN (<i>Psychology</i>)	Bucknell University
ORLANDO J. HOLLIS (<i>Law</i>)	University of Oregon
ALBERT HENRY IMLAH (<i>History</i>)	Tufts College
JULIAN GILBERT LEACH (<i>Plant Pathology</i>)	West Virginia University
KATHERINE H. PORTER (<i>English</i>)	Western Reserve University
RALPH S. UNDERWOOD (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Texas Technological College
GEORGE C. WHEELER (<i>Biology</i>)	University of North Dakota
KENNETH P. WILLIAMS (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Indiana University

1947-1949

CLARENCE A. BERDAHL (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of Illinois
EARL CRANSTON (<i>Religion, History</i>)	Dartmouth College
JAMES HOLLADAY (<i>Banking, Finance</i>)	University of Alabama
O. B. JESNESS (<i>Agricultural Economics</i>)	University of Minnesota
THEODORE KOPPANYI (<i>Pharmacology</i>)	Georgetown University
ARTHUR W. MARTIN, JR. (<i>Physiology</i>)	University of Washington
FRED B. MILLETT (<i>English, Literature</i>)	Wesleyan University
W. ALBERT NOYES, JR. (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Rochester
GEORGE E. POTTER (<i>Zoology</i>)	Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas
LLOYD W. TAYLOR (<i>Physics</i>)	Oberlin College

1948-1950

WILLIAM RAY DENNES (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of California
MARY JO FINK (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	University of Louisville
J. SUTHERLAND FRAME (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Michigan State College
JAMES A. FUNKHOUSER (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of New Hampshire
JAMES HART (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of Virginia
RICHARD HARTSHORNE (<i>Geography</i>)	University of Wisconsin
MABEL NEWCOMER (<i>Economics</i>)	Vassar College
J. RUD NIELSEN (<i>Physics</i>)	University of Oklahoma
CHESLEY J. POSEY (<i>Engineering</i>)	State University of Iowa
GEORGE JARVIS THOMPSON (<i>Law</i>)	Cornell University

FORMER PRESIDENTS

W. T. LAPRADE (<i>History</i>)	Duke University
QUINCY WRIGHT (<i>International Law</i>)	University of Chicago
EDWARD C. KIRKLAND (<i>History</i>)	Bowdoin College

CONTENTS

THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION, <i>Byron S. Hollinshead</i>	257
EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY, <i>Waldo Gifford Leland</i>	272
THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, <i>Jesse P. Bogue</i>	285
SCIENCE AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, <i>Ralph W. Gerard and Theodore Koppanyi</i>	296
SOCIAL SCIENCE AND SOCIAL POLICY, <i>Robert Bierstedt</i>	310
THE MILITARY HISTORIAN OVERSEAS, <i>Lynn M. Case</i>	320
LITERATURE AND THE CONSENT OF THE SOPHOMORE, <i>Robert H. West</i>	335
THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT AS HE IS TODAY, <i>B. W. Kunkel</i> ..	344
THE RÔLE OF LOGIC IN CONTEMPORARY EDUCATION, <i>Marie T. Copp</i>	350
EDUCATING THE HEART, <i>Robert Berkelman</i>	356
THREE PATTERNS OF LIVING, <i>Frank Davidson</i>	364
THE MUSICIAN AND THE DOCTOR'S DEGREE, <i>Rowland W. Dunham</i>	375
GILT FOR THE LILY, <i>Thomas Francis Maher</i>	382
THE IMPROVEMENT OF EXAMINATIONS, <i>L. L. Thurstone</i>	394
SOCRATES ON THE SALARY QUESTION, <i>William Peirce Randel</i> ..	398
CONSTRUCTION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS' SALARY SCHEDULES, <i>Henry G. Badger</i>	406
THE ASSOCIATION AND THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE PRO- FESSION, <i>Ralph E. Himstead</i>	419
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	425
MEMBERSHIP.....	426
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	453

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

Contributors to This Issue

HENRY G. BADGER is Specialist in Educational Statistics in the United States Office of Education.

ROBERT BERKELMAN is Professor of English at Bates College.

ROBERT BIERSTEDT is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Illinois.

JESSE P. BOGUE is Executive Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

LYNN M. CASE is Associate Professor of History at the University of Pennsylvania.

MARIE T. COPP is Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Philosophy at Wilson College.

FRANK DAVIDSON is Professor of English and Director of Courses in English Composition and American Literature at Indiana University.

ROWLAND W. DUNHAM is Dean of the School of Music of the University of Colorado.

RALPH W. GERARD is Professor of Physiology at the University of Chicago.

BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD is President of Coe College.

THEODORE KOPPANYI is Professor of Pharmacology and Materia Medica at Georgetown University.

B. W. KUNKEL is Professor of Biology at Lafayette College.

WALDO GIFFORD LELAND is Director Emeritus of the American Council of Learned Societies.

THOMAS FRANCIS MAHER was Registrar at Georgetown University and is now engaged in the practice of law in Washington, D. C.

WILLIAM PEIRCE RANDEL is Associate Professor of English at Florida State University.

L. L. THURSTONE is Professor of Psychology at the University of Chicago.

ROBERT H. WEST is Associate Professor of English at the University of Georgia.

THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION¹

By BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD

Coe College

I have made some uncomplimentary remarks about the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education in a speech which was not on the subject of the Report, and I am therefore grateful for this opportunity to discuss the Report directly and to buttress my earlier generalizations by supporting evidence. However, I want to make clear that even in a paper of this length one cannot hope to do more than debate a few major points of a report which is presented in five volumes of what seemed to me to be somewhat undigested thought, with a sixth volume containing statistical tables which might be used to prove almost anything, including some of the conclusions of the Commission.

The major thesis of the Report, it seems to me, is that a very large number of young people who would benefit from higher education do not have an opportunity to get such an education because they lack money and that this group therefore can properly be denominated as "lost leadership" (page 20, Volume VI). Everyone would agree, I think, that there is a substantial group not in college which should be there. The question is, how big is it? My arguments against the major thesis of the Report are three: one, that the Commission has vastly exaggerated the number of these young people; two, that the Commission rather snobbishly and incorrectly assumes that educational advancement is possible only by a prolonged internment in college classrooms; and three, that "leadership" is not necessarily "lost" because the individual does not attend college.

In a careful mathematical analysis of the major studies which

¹ Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Iowa Conference of the American Association of University Professors, The State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, May 1, 1948.

bear on the distribution of ability as it relates to educational opportunity, Robert J. Havighurst has estimated that "out of a hundred boys and girls of a given age, about five are good 'college material,' but do not go to college. Some of this group would go to college if given financial help, others wouldn't."¹ This leads Havighurst to the conclusion "that scholarships for two or three per cent of the age group, in addition to such scholarships as now exist, would meet the need." This calculation is arrived at by assuming that approximately the same proportion in the lower income groups would go to college, if financial considerations were not involved, as now attend from higher income groups.

Five per cent of the age group would be a number equivalent to one-third of those now attending college (fifteen per cent of the age group) or 500,000. It can easily be argued, of course, that this one-third might replace the bottom one-third of those now in college to the benefit of everyone, but I shall not argue that case in this paper. If we assume that this five per cent be added to present normal college enrollments of 1,500,000 and if we make a liberal estimate of the effect of increased population, we might have a college enrollment by 1960 of 3,000,000 students, or double the pre-World War II enrollment, but certainly not the triple figure of 4,600,000 estimated by the Commission. The figure I have just given agrees with an independent estimate made by Dr. Harry K. Newburn, President of the University of Oregon.²

To take care of the additional scholarships needed to provide higher education for those denied it because of lack of money the \$120,000,000 which the Commission recommends in its report is about right, since it would provide 240,000 scholarships of \$500 apiece for the number Havighurst estimates as needing such help (between two and three per cent of the age group). I use the figure of \$500, since this seems to have been a satisfactory figure in providing tuition for G. I. education. Also, I would have no quarrel

¹ *The Distribution of Ability in Relation to Educational Opportunity*, Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society, Harvard University, 1943 (mimeographed). This paper is an analysis of the studies by Harlan Updegraff, *Inventory of Youth in Pennsylvania*; Helen B. Goetsch, *Parental Income and College Opportunities*; and Cyril Burt, *Ability and Income*.

² "Financing Higher Education in the United States," a paper delivered before a National Conference on Higher Education in Chicago, March 22, 1948.

with the graduate fellowships which the Commission proposes except that the number is excessive. My quarrel is with the other forms of aid which the Commission recommends, and my contention from the foregoing is that the Commission has exaggerated the number who would go to college if money were available to them.

My second contention is that the Commission assumes a snobbish point of view in its assumption that everyone to be informed, cultured, and ethical needs to go to college. Far be it from me to belittle college education. I have urged its value all my life. But there are, after all, churches, libraries, museums, newspapers and magazines, correspondence schools, radios, corporation training schools, apprenticeships, work experiences, and educational movies. (The Armed Forces also claim they educate.) If you add all these together you have a total educational influence of tremendous importance aside from colleges. The college can aid the education of the individual and it can guide him but I suspect that everyone largely educates himself. Certainly the college cannot do it. Anyone who has read the Pennsylvania Studies made under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation realizes that some high-school freshmen know more than some seniors; some high-school juniors know more than some college juniors; that our whole educational system is largely based on time; and that many students might be wise to get away from our typical school and college standardization. With all sorts of educational opportunities, aside from college, open to them, young people can pursue education, if they have the initiative, as far as they can go and as fast as they can go without going to college at all.

It seems to me, therefore, that when the Commission talks about "lost leadership" and assumes that all Americans since 1900 who have not attended college have therefore had little or no influence, they are simply talking through their hats. To use a few examples, would anyone think that Edison and Ford were good cases of lost leadership? If it be argued that their careers would be impossible now, Mr. Charles Erwin Wilson, President of General Electric, seems to manufacture quite a few light bulbs although he never studied in college and Mr. Henry Kaiser seems to be starting a new motor company though he never went to college except to get honorary degrees. If it be thought that business is an exception,

it may be said, I think, that Grant Wood attained some distinction as a Midwestern artist; that Ernest Hemingway is thought to be a distinguished novelist; and that Eugene O'Neill, whose time in college was certainly short, seems to have made a reputation as a dramatist. Even the President of the United States, who also went to college only to get honorary degrees, is not without influence. In Cedar Rapids we have just elected to his fifth term a mayor who saw the inside of a college only briefly, and our largest local corporation, the Quaker Oats Company, recently appointed a general manager who had only finished the eighth grade. These people would all be surprised to know that they have been engaging all their lives in a kind of reverie, merely fancying that they were exercising a leadership which actually they have "lost."

To be sure, entrance to the professions of medicine, law, theology, and teaching is now by the route educators have prescribed. But to make the claim, even by implication, that attendance in college classrooms is the only way to make a man healthy, wealthy, and wise not only seems to me to be placing on colleges more burden than they can bear, but it is also an assertion which one day may react against us.

But it is not simply that the Commission has made an excessive estimate of those who might go to college if they had the money. I think some of their reasoning would change the whole character of our educational standards for the worse. The Commission estimates that forty-nine per cent of the age group have the ability to profit from two years of college. Since only about forty-five per cent of the age group now graduate from high school, this would be one hundred per cent college attendance by high-school graduates either in community institutes or in four-year colleges or universities. Since the work offered in the community institutes would be largely terminal and vocational in nature, I have no great quarrel with this proposal as it relates to these institutes except to think the Commission has greatly overestimated the number of those who would go. It wouldn't be one hundred per cent. The studies of Hand¹ would lead one to the conclusion that if cash high-school scholarships could be granted the number of those graduating from

¹ Hand, Harold C., *General Education in the American High School*, Chicago, Scott Foresman and Company, 1942.

high school might be increased by about ten per cent of the age group. This might mean that fifty-five to sixty per cent of the age group would graduate from high school by 1960. But even in states like California and Utah, where a high proportion now graduate from high school and have free junior colleges to attend, the proportion of those attending junior colleges is seldom over fifty per cent of the high-school graduates. This means that the total attendance, even for two years, in places where the situation has been optimum has not been over one-third of the age group. One-third, however, is the figure the Commission estimates as having the ability to finish a four-year college course. I submit that this estimate also is excessive, for it assumes that two-thirds of present high-school graduates could be four-year college graduates. This proposal can only mean a considerable lowering of standards, even if a much greater variety of course-offerings is provided.

But let me get away from statistics for a moment. The Report presents a number of paradoxes suitable for a Gilbert and Sullivan operetta. On page 58, Volume V, it says of privately controlled institutions that they should maintain the "free inquiry they have established. . . so important in providing certain safeguards to freedom." To give them up "would be contrary to the best interests of these institutions as well [as] to those of society in general." On page 46, Volume V, the Report says, "The Commission is. . . . aware of the fact that its proposals for a great expansion of higher education in publicly controlled institutions may make it extremely difficult for many private institutions to survive."

This seems to me to be the same as if our government in its recent campaign to eradicate disease among the cattle of Mexico had said we should add to the infected herds and kill off the uninfected. Or are state universities "sacred cows?"

Or, to take another paradox, after the Commission has said that privately controlled institutions should have no tax support and that their support must come from philanthropy it makes the interesting point (page 47, Volume V) that "the strengthening of publicly supported institutions" may increase "the gradual upward trend in the flow of [private] benefactions to state institutions." In short, the state colleges not only want to restrict tax-support to themselves but they hope to increase private support. This neat

"heads I win, tails you lose" proposition is like a football game in which one contestant operates on both sides of the fifty yard line but the other one may operate on one side only.

Or, to take another interesting bit of logic, at which even the more sober gods must have laughed: Although claiming that the Commission's program would bring greater production (page 49, Volume V), higher income, increased tax potential (which means that if the individual increases his income and production he will be allowed to pay higher taxes), the Commission states its sad conviction (page 38, Volume V) that "Many of the wealthier states. . . make the least effort, as measured by percentage of State income devoted to the support of publicly controlled institutions. . . . One of the major reasons" being that these states "tend to rely more heavily than the others upon privately controlled institutions for the services of higher education." Having just read a bulletin with the heading that you can't have a great state without a great state university (Colorado) I wonder if the Commission can be reading its own mail. Here are some great states which apparently do not understand that their evident prosperity is a mistake. While I think no careful statistician would argue that education is ever much more than a reflection of prosperity, not a cause of it, the Commission does not hesitate to argue that an increase in state-supported education will bring the millenium, and then it points with some scorn to those prosperous states which have been so stupid as to get prosperous without the benefits of a higher education which was loaded on the backs of the taxpayers.

II

But, turning from the excessive figures and interesting paradoxes of the Report, one is led to wonder what will happen to academic freedom if tax-supported education triples its size to accommodate the Committee's proposal of 4,600,000 students in colleges by 1960 and if independent colleges and universities dwindle in number and influence. Apropos of this matter, it may be argued that Elementary and Secondary schools have been controlled without serious loss of freedom and that there is no reason to fear a serious loss of freedom in a more extensive control by the public of institutions

of higher education. Whether or not our Elementary and Secondary schools have been free of interference, which is debatable, their curricula are not of a kind to make them vulnerable to interference. Their curricula do not deal very much with controversial matters and are not apt to be interfered with except perhaps in the teaching of biology and history. That is not true of the curricula of colleges and universities. With the exception of technical and professional courses, the curricula of colleges and universities are concerned with subject matter much of which is controversial in nature. That is particularly true of the curriculum of the Liberal Arts College. The Liberal Arts College, with a subject matter consisting largely of ideas in the fields of social studies, the humanities and science, must present all aspects of every question if the College is to do its job. The Liberal Arts College must be a place of intellectual ferment in which both the teachers and the students feel free to express themselves about government, religion, and social issues. The Liberal Arts College must, if it is to fulfill its obligations to society, operate as a perpetual forum where the greatest freedom of thought and expression must prevail. A Liberal Arts College cannot be regarded as an educational institution if it is administered in accordance with the philosophy enunciated recently by a State University President: "The tradition of our College is to allow no discussion of controversial issues on the campus."¹

Let us look at the State of Iowa for a moment. You realize by now, of course, that if I were running for the school board in Cedar Rapids I would not be allowed to address you today. I don't know that I would even be allowed to set foot on this campus, for to be a candidate for an elective office in the eyes of the Iowa State Board of Education is to put oneself in the category of "suspicious character." Those of you so benighted as to think that students should be educated for citizenship by having all aspects of truth presented to them will realize how wrong you have been. Or, if you try to get the members of the Iowa State Board of Education to explain why they have such a policy as the one I have described, you will discover a new kind of curtain, not iron, just gauzily opaque.

Or to take another case. About a year ago the Cedar Rapids

¹ Quoted from an editorial of the *Des Moines Register*, April 6, 1948.

Gazette wanted to publish an article quoting professors of economics on what they thought about the possible demise of the O. P. A. The paper called Coe College and got a long statement from our economics professor. They then called seven or eight members of the economics department at the State University of Iowa, who would not talk for fear of the legislature. Yet man, as Aristotle has said, is a political animal. One of the most important of the academic freedoms is the freedom to criticize government. If, in their educational programs, state colleges and universities do not have freedoms in this field, they do not have any freedom worth talking about.

These examples and others lead me to subscribe wholeheartedly to the statement of dissent by two members of the President's Commission, Monsignor Hochwalt and Mr. McGuire, which says: "We fear that legislation implementing the Commission's recommendations would go a long way toward establishing an administrative structure for higher education whereby government in the United States might easily use the nation's public colleges and universities to promote its political purposes." (Page 66, Volume V.)

If the Commission kills off the private colleges, what agency then will give state colleges even the freedom they now have? As Raymond B. Fosdick has said:¹

State colleges and universities have frequently been jeopardized by the arbitrary acts of those who hold political power. When that time comes the private institutions must be the counteracting agencies to keep the light of freedom burning. When Governor Talmadge terrorized the University of Georgia it was institutions like Emory University, Agnes Scott College, and Mercer University that maintained in the state the basic decencies of independence. The steadying influence of Tulane University in the days of Huey Long in Louisiana cannot be overestimated. When the Board of Regents in Texas recently threatened the integrity of the state institutions, it was Rice Institute and Southern Methodist University that held the banner of free scholarship.

¹ *The Rôle of the Private College*, Swarthmore College Bulletin, Vol. XLIV, No. 6, 1947.

III

The objections I have raised thus far to the proposals of the Commission relate to excessive claims and to potential loss of academic freedom. My next objection is perhaps an over-concern for economy. It isn't very fashionable these days to speak in small terms, but I am staggered by the Commission's figures. On page 26, Volume V, the Commission estimates that the total annual cost of higher education in 1960 should be about \$3,250,000,000. Using the figure of \$500 again, which the Veterans Administration used to get a year's tuition for a veteran, I find that this figure will produce 6,500,000 annual scholarships of \$500. This is about the number of students now in high school. The figure of \$3,250,000,000 is the equivalent of the entire sum now being spent in all the high schools and grammar schools of America to educate about thirty million pupils. If this figure (\$3,250,000,000) be used as a student-cost basis for the 3,700,000 students the Commission wants to educate in the public institutions, it comes out at the rate of \$878 for the tuition of each student. Average annual costs for college education per student per year are about \$560 except for capital expenditures or costs of capital. Does the Commission expect to toss in an electric refrigerator with each registration? A more sensible proposal, in my opinion, has been made by Dr. Newburn, President of the University of Oregon. In a recent paper, as I have indicated, he estimates that college enrollments may reach 3,000,000 by 1960. He suggests that a part of the financial problem might be solved if the state colleges would charge twice the tuition proposed by the President's Commission and then provide a generous scholarship plan to help "really competent students who need the assistance."

This proposal makes real sense. It is actually more socialized than the Report of the Commission. Why should the taxpayers subsidize substantially those students who are well able to pay reasonable tuition costs? This suggestion by Dr. Newburn agrees with a suggestion by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., some years ago in which he said that he did not see why endowments of private colleges should be used to support those who were well able to pay.

For many years scholarships in private colleges have been based

on need, and the genuineness of such need has not been too difficult to discover. In all their operations of tax collections, relief, and health services, the government seems able to make distinctions both in collecting taxes and in paying out benefits between those who are able to pay and those who are not able to pay. Why cannot such a distinction be applied to public higher education? If the state universities would charge a reasonable tuition, say \$350 per year, to those who can afford to pay, they would not need even as much support as they now get, and they might have a much more generous scholarship program. Certainly, they would not need the astronomic figures the Commission proposes. I, for one, have more confidence in the merit of state colleges than they seem to have in themselves. Surely there must be students who will go to state colleges even if such colleges do not offer such large subsidies. While I realize that numbers are vastly important to the legislature, isn't it possible that legislators might be impressed by other services? Is it necessary for state colleges to count all those who pass by the front door plus the cadavers in the medical school to impress the appropriations committee?

A prime example of the astronomic support state colleges are even now getting is provided by the University of Illinois. The appropriation for this biennium to that institution is sixty millions for operating expenses and thirteen millions for new buildings. The Provost of the University tells me that of the thirty million a year appropriated for running expenses eight and one-half million is a reappropriation of tuition fees. This leaves twenty-one and one-half million as an operating subsidy. The only way one can compare the University of Illinois with independent universities is to capitalize this figure into endowment. At present rates of return on endowment it would take over seven hundred millions to return this much. Using the figures of university endowments published by the *World Almanac* one finds that he would have to add together the total endowments of the following independent institutions of higher education to get such a figure: Harvard University, Yale University, Columbia University, University of Chicago, Princeton University, Stanford University, Johns Hopkins University, Brown University, Boston University, California Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,

University of Notre Dame, Catholic University of America, Syracuse University, New York University, and Northwestern University.

And there are a half dozen state universities the size of the University of Illinois, but the foregoing figures are not really the most startling. The Commission reports on page 30, Volume V, with admirable correctness, that the total income from endowments for current operation of the 800 or so private colleges and universities is \$70,000,000 annually. The appropriations to any three or four large state universities added together are equivalent then to the total endowment income of the 800 or more privately controlled colleges and universities. The three or four large state universities are educating 100,000 to 125,000 students. Yet the privately controlled institutions which receive the \$70,000,000 from endowment educate well over 1,000,000 students without any expense to the taxpayer at all. In short, the privately controlled colleges educate over ten times as many students with the same amount of endowment support as the three or four state colleges get from their legislatures.

It will be argued that there is a difference in the ability to pay between the students of the state institutions and the students of the private colleges. If there is such a difference in the Midwest, it certainly is not visible to the naked eye. I suggest that if the splendor of fraternity and sorority houses be one criterion, the country club crowd is at least as well represented in state institutions as in private colleges. Or, if the proportion of students who own their own cars be another criterion, I suggest that you try to find a place to park around this university when classes are in session.

In this respect the Commission's argument is that, of all the nation's young people who might conceivably go to college, 3,700,000 cannot afford to pay even reasonable costs, but that perhaps 900,000 can do so. This ratio of 3.7 to 0.9 means that the Commission believes that approximately four out of five college students are needy. It must be that the Commission figures that by 1960 the increase in state socialism requiring confiscatory taxation will make nearly everybody needy, but we are hardly at that point yet. According to the Commission's own figures, about half the students

of college age can afford to make a reasonable contribution toward their college education (page 6, Volume II).

IV

The question may reasonably be asked, "Well, what are you for, if you are against much of the Commission's Report?" I am for the scholarship provisions which allow the student to go where he pleases. It seems to me that the N. Y. A. and the G. I. Bill set an excellent example in this respect and provided a kind of equality between privately controlled and publicly controlled institutions. I am for the graduate fellowships except that I think the number needed is not as large as the Commission suggests. I am for community institutes or junior colleges, except that I think they should be supported by their local communities, by state aid, and by the students. In this connection I should like to call the attention of the Commission to the fact that for twenty-five years the literature of the junior college movement as it relates to public junior colleges has contended that junior colleges are extensions of secondary education. Public junior college people have always argued for this definition and I do not see why, therefore, the Commission makes a change. There are very distinct advantages to public junior colleges if they are considered to be a part of secondary education, and they can't be both secondary and higher education.

I am wholeheartedly for all those verbalisms in which the Commission argues against discrimination on racial or religious grounds, but I would contend that privately controlled institutions have at least as good a record in this respect as the state colleges. For example, the oldest of the ivy-league colleges, Harvard University, in electing the three marshalls for its 1948 commencement chose a Negro, a Catholic, and a Jew.

On the other side, I think many of the figures the Commission has used are excessive or exaggerated. I think it unfortunate that the membership of the Commission was so heavily loaded with those disposed to view education as a function of the state. Further, it seems to me that if the Commission's proposals be accepted we face a decline in the number of privately controlled institutions and in the size of those which survive. This, in my opinion, will

mean a decline in quality education and a loss in academic freedom.

Specifically, how will this affect the objectives of the American Association of University Professors. I think many of the things for which your Association stands will be lost. Your Association cannot influence a legislature or a politically appointed state board of education as it can a board of trustees of an independent college. Further, I question whether any of our present voluntary educational agencies supported by free institutions will maintain their influence if the Commission's recommendations are carried out. The voluntary accrediting agencies have always been faced with the problem of what to do with state institutions and these institutions in the future may control accrediting completely. If the status of the United States Office of Education, which has had a useful place as an informational and statistical agency, be "raised" (recommended on page 73, Volume III), then there will be no very clear function for such voluntary organizations as the American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges. The public institutions would get their information right from the feed box, and the private institutions would probably perform form a mutually protective association of their own.

In drawing the lines separating the tax-supported institutions from the independent colleges it may be that the Commission has done a favor to us all to make clear a breach which was perhaps sure to come, though I think it would not have come if the Commission had not gone so far over on the side of publicly controlled education.

Some of my friends in state universities have suggested that I shouldn't speak out against the Report of the President's Commission because we all have the same interest—education—and one shouldn't rock the boat. There was a time when I would have believed that the interests of public and private education were similar if not identical, but I do not now believe it.

We compete for the same dollar and there are only so many dollars. High federal taxes have taken away many prospective gifts to private colleges, as the Commission itself has pointed out. In fact, high taxes have made future large gifts well nigh impossible. Just recently the state comptroller of Iowa sent me his budget for the next fiscal year. The figure allocated for the running expenses

of our three public institutions of higher education was set down as \$12,500,000.¹ This figure is enough to provide 25,000 annual scholarships of \$500 apiece—about one and a half again as many as the total number of high school graduates in Iowa each year. (Yet if one reads the newspapers about prosperity in Iowa, he is sure to wonder where 25,000 needy high-school graduates can be found.) Actually the total of college students in Iowa before the war was only about 25,000. There are now about 43,000, of which about 23,000 are in the public institutions. The privately controlled institutions educate the other 20,000 at no expense to the taxpayers, and the total annual income of the private institutions from endowments would not be much over one-half million dollars.

Contrasted with the \$12,500,000 which is budgeted for the State Board of Education, the comptroller has budgeted \$10,000,000 as receipts from the state income tax (actually it will run somewhat higher). Does anyone think that the citizens of this state would not give more generously to the private colleges if they had no state income tax? Further, the University of Iowa sponsored three special drives for voluntary contributions in Cedar Rapids last year. In one drive the university sought to raise \$25,000 for the Nile Kinnick Fund for athletes who are also students. Another was the annual "I" Club drive of \$10 per member to support athletics. Still another was a drive for money to buy objects of art for the University. Those drives seek money from the same people the private colleges solicit. These people have only so much money to give away and such drives hurt the private colleges.

Lest the foregoing be thought to be a criticism of the University of Iowa, may I say at once that it is not meant to be. This university is playing the game according to the present rules and I, personally, have nothing but good will toward the university and its officers. All I'm saying is that the liberal arts colleges are already

¹ It may be argued that the state institutions maintain other than teaching services and to us per student costs does not cover such expenses as agricultural stations, home economics advisors, etc. The \$12,500,000 is just a starter. State institutions have other sources of income such as special interim appropriations, special appropriations for special projects, gifts and endowment income, contracts for research, federal Smith-Hughes money, and income from Veterans Administration for instructional costs. These ought to cover nonstudent-related expenses easily.

disadvantaged and the Commission proposes to handicap them still further.

Like the politician appealing to "the peepul" the Commission sheds crocodile tears for the needy student. It is an appeal which is difficult to resist because demagoguery is in it. I was a needy undergraduate myself. I waited on table for my meals, I took care of a furnace for my room, and I sold my blood for transfusions and worked holidays and summers to raise the money to pay my tuition. I wouldn't claim that this experience did me any particular good. Neither would I agree that it did me any harm. Now that I think of it, I'm rather glad that I wasn't a ward of the state and that I took a liberal arts course which the Commission scorns as "aristocratic."

The broad question is: Do we need to subsidize those not in need of such subsidy? Must we pay bureaucrats a brokerage for handling our own money for us? Is it a good thing for the nation to forsake the voluntarism represented by large numbers of voluntarily supported and independently controlled hospitals, charitable organizations, and colleges and universities?

In one of his charming essays, a member of my honored opposition on today's program and a member of the Commission, Dr. Earl J. McGrath, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts of this institution, refers to an alleged tombstone in an unlocated cemetery in Pennsylvania on which the epitaph refers to the lifelong opposition of the departed to public education.¹ Is Dean McGrath seeking an epitaph for his own tombstone to read: I was one of a group which put the kibosh on the independently controlled colleges and universities of America. . . . "which [were] so important in providing certain safeguards to freedom." (Page 58, Volume V.)

¹ Quoted from "Higher Education for American Democracy," *Journal of American Association of University Women*, Vol. 41, No. 3, 1948, p. 163.

EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY¹

By WALDO GIFFORD LELAND

American Council of Learned Societies

The charter of Brown University, which provided that five of its trustees "shall forever be elected of the denomination called Friends or Quakers," was granted at the "General Assembly of the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in New England, in America. . . holden at East Greenwich . . . on the last Monday in February, in the year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Sixty Four, and fourth of the reign of his most sacred majesty George the Third." The preamble of the act granting the charter ran in this wise:

Whereas institutions for liberal education are highly beneficial to society by forming the rising generation to virtue, knowledge, and useful literature, and thus preserving in the community a succession of men duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation; they have therefore justly merited and received the attention and encouragement of every wise and well regulated State.

Brown University, which is my alma mater, was the seventh institution for liberal education to be established within the present boundaries of the United States, whereas now there are approximately 1600 institutions of higher education. Education has been called the great American religion; it has also become a major American industry. For at least a century it has been the subject of discussion which has steadily grown in volume and intensity.

The literature of this discussion, in the form of articles, addresses, pamphlets, reports, and books, has received formidable additions

¹ Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Patrons' Auxiliary of the Sidwell Friends School, Washington, D. C., May 12, 1948.

during the last half decade as a part of our effort at readjustment to a changing world, and the conscientious educator who would endeavor to master it all would find the task long and heavy. Conferences have been organized, symposia have been performed, learned societies and councils have deliberated, committees have been appointed, Presidential commissions have been set up, faculties have been mobilized, and even associations of alumni have shown signs of interest in the chief business of their respective *almae matres*. The discussion still goes on; as I started to prepare this paper I received a large volume having the title *Ferment in Education*,¹ and containing addresses by sixteen educators, scientists, and scholars delivered on the occasion of the recent inauguration of the President of the University of Illinois.

Most of this reading matter is in plain English which can be followed and understood by the intelligent reader who is willing to apply his mind to the task; a little of it has true literary distinction; some of it is in the curious code devised by educators for the purpose of saying what everybody knows in a language which nobody can understand.

Through it all there sounds a note of urgency; a theme of impending crisis constantly recurs; a sense of great social and moral changes, of unknown velocity and direction, adds poignancy to the search for solutions of problems which cannot themselves be clearly formulated.

In all this literature there is much repetition, and its net tonnage is far less than its gross displacement. A skillful and diligent abstractor could summarize it and present it in the digested form so dear to those who get their news and other information from headlines and between commercials.

For my own part, on the basis of a sampling which I admit is superficial, I would present the pattern of thought somewhat as follows:

Everybody must be educated as far as he is capable of education. But those who are capable of the highest education must be sorted out from the mass and their feet must be set on the paths which stretch beyond our present horizons. Education is for life rather than for livelihood, yet without means of livelihood life itself is be-

¹ University of Illinois Press, 1948.

set by frustrations. The most important training is that of the mind, and the mind must be so trained that it will be able to deal with the unforeseen problems which it will encounter. The educated man must be free and yet must be willing and able to accept the responsibilities which the world in which he lives confers upon him, if he and his fellow beings are to remain free. The content of education will be determined in large part by personal aptitudes and interests which must be skillfully appraised, in part by social needs, in part by circumstance and chance. It will be drawn from the various areas of knowledge which we describe as the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities, and it will be designed to give the student, during his period of formal education, a varied intellectual experience and a broad foundation of knowledge, as well as an understanding and appreciation of spiritual and aesthetic values and the ability to make wise decisions involving criticism and choice.

Thus equipped he should be, in the words of the Brown charter, "qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation." And so, after all this discussion we get back to the starting point.

II

We have heard much of the four freedoms, to achieve which for all mankind we fought the Second World War a generation after we had fought the First World War to make the world safe for democracy. Slogans are useful, but they are also dangerous, and the slogans of the two wars must have an ironical sound in many parts of this present world. Nevertheless, they express ideals which are worthy of all our efforts, present and future.

What of the freedom which education strives to achieve for the educated man? The late Hoyt Hudson¹ points out that "there are three foes against which liberal education . . . must fight unremittingly. . . . They are ignorance, muddleheadedness and crassness." By muddleheadedness, Hudson says he means "muddled or fuzzy thinking," and by crassness "insensitivity or spiritual blindness." It is freedom from this limitation which liberal educa-

Educating Liberally, Stanford University Press, 1945, p. 10.

tion must achieve. It is essentially an intellectual and spiritual freedom.

Freedom from ignorance is the freedom of choice and action which comes from sure knowledge. The distressing and often expensive results of ignorance of the mechanisms of our own bodies, or, let us say, of our own automobiles or houses, are frequently borne in on us. Ignorance of matters which concern us most nearly can be disastrous. The vital importance of exact and complete knowledge was demonstrated during the world wars, and is demonstrated every day in aviation and surface transportation, in engineering and construction, in the maintenance of health and the cure of disease, and in countless other fields of action. When our safety, comfort, and convenience depend on knowledge we are intolerant of any lack of it. Yet we tolerate ignorance or quasi-knowledge in the realm of ideas, in our political life, and in our social relations. The reasons for this inconsistency are obvious though specious. When we are dealing with physical matter we can ascertain its behavior under known conditions and we can test the accuracy of our observations. In the concerns of the spirit and of human relations, however, we tend to rely on our own incomplete experience and the opinions we have ourselves formed on that insufficient basis. Consequently, our decisions are often made in ignorance of relevant knowledge and we are content to think that one opinion is as good as another, or that the majority can't be wrong, or that the minority is always right, according to our personal dispositions and prejudices. A major task of liberal education is to make such reliance on ignorance and on muddled thinking intolerable, and to inspire us with the determination to achieve true intellectual freedom.

But liberal education is not an abstraction, although we often discuss it as though it were. It consists of instruction and inquiry in selected matters and there has long been controversy, at times bitter and vehement, as to how the selection of educational content should be made. We have come a far distance from the three R's of the red schoolhouse, a distance comparable to that from the pony post to the instant voice of radio around the world; and many marvels have been encountered along the way and there have been revolutions in our modes of life and thought.

Life did not seem simple to our ancestors of the pony-post age, though their life seems infinitely simple to us as we look back on it in historical perspective, as through a telescope in reverse. But at least their attention was not claimed every morning by what had taken place on the opposite side of the globe since they went to bed, nor did they have to maintain private means of transportation and manslaughter at fifty miles per hour, nor feel anxious and responsible for the welfare of China, Japan, Micronesia, Palestine, Bizonia, and the union of Western Europe, nor fight fifth columns and Soviet vilification. Above all they did not have to make endless choices as to what they should eat, or as to what gadgets and other expensive devices they should buy in order to save work and make the process of living more complicated, and their houses were not invaded by the hysterical clamor of commentators, advertisers, and soap opera. They lived in a world of distances, of time, and of seasons, but they did not live in it as long as we contrive to live in a world of now and here. They had less doubt as to right and wrong and the nature of God, and their belief in the essential goodness of mankind had not been staggered by the incredible mass evil of which civilized and educated peoples have shown themselves capable in our time.

The problem of education for the present and oncoming generations is made infinitely difficult because we live in a world to which we have not become adjusted, and whose future we cannot clearly foresee. But the same qualities of mind will be needed now and in the future as in the past, no matter how difficult may be the uses to which they may be put.

III

We have of late, and in this country more than elsewhere, set up three main divisions of learning, or of educational content, with their attendant disciplines, which we describe as the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. This compartmentalization may have certain practical advantages, but it has on the whole been unfortunate. Nevertheless colleges and universities, foundations and associations have adopted it and the curricula of most institutions observe it. But it is clear that a liberal education

must be derived from all three of these divisions, and that each of them has indispensable contributions to make to the formation of the mind.

The sciences should above all exercise the mind in exact observation, in accurate reporting, and in reaching objective conclusions justified by the evidence. Further they should implant the mental habit of the scientific method and attitude, easy enough to maintain in the presence of material facts which have no emotional significance, but far harder to achieve when dealing with issues to which moral values are attached and which involve emotions and sentiments. In this way, education derived from the study of the sciences should go far to free the mind from prejudices and superstitions and to combat the vices of muddled thinking and intellectual laziness.

But the sciences, with their vast and rapidly growing accumulations of knowledge, have also to bring invaluable contributions of content into the educational process. We live in an age in which knowledge of our physical environment, that is, of the setting in which our lives are placed, has increased beyond the most fantastic imaginings of our forebears of a few generations ago. The applications of this knowledge to uses which affect almost every act and every moment of our lives, and which are profoundly affecting our thought about ourselves and our world, have taken place within the memory of many who are still alive. No person can be thought to be liberally educated who has not some knowledge of how this change has come about and who does not understand its basic principles and facts. He who cannot grasp the relevance of this change to his own life is not free to make the present and future adjustments which will be the price of existence. Intellectually he will be little better than a fossil vestige of an age which has passed.

The social sciences and the humanities are so closely related that to try to separate them is like the dangerous operation of cutting Siamese twins apart. I have tried to distinguish the two fields of study by definition, but the definition has so many exceptions that its ultimate validity may be questioned. The social sciences, I have said, deal with man in his associations and relations with other men, while the humanities deal with man's spiritual life and experience. But associations and relations among men are so affected by the

individual's spiritual life and experience—which in turn are equally affected by his associations and relations with other men—that neither can be studied in isolation. Nevertheless let us, for convenience of reference and to fit the present frame of education, consider these two fields of study separately.

The social sciences are relatively new in our curricula, although law is of venerable antiquity, and economics, or political economy as we formerly knew it, is of respectable age. But political science, an offshoot of law, and sociology, of hybrid origin, were just beginning to appear in college curricula half a century ago. History, the most ancient of the social sciences, is also solidly established among the humanities and for reasons of personal preference I shall discuss it later. The inevitable specialization which breaks up all disciplines into sub-disciplines has introduced into the curricula a host of new subjects—demography or human geography, population studies, agricultural economics, public administration, social anthropology, etc.

It is obvious that the social sciences have a contribution of the utmost importance to make to the formation of the educated mind. During the last quarter of a century the social sciences have been chiefly absorbed, at least in the United States, in an effort to establish methods of investigation comparable to the methods of the natural sciences, and capable of securing results of equal validity. Whether their efforts will be entirely successful may be doubted; factors of personalities, prejudices, changing modes and opinions, are too numerous and important to make it likely that men will achieve reliable generalizations which can be formulated as laws. Nevertheless, much is being learned about human relations which is not in accord with previously held notions, and there can be no doubt as to the reality and usefulness of a near-science of society. To take part in this intensive effort to learn more and more about ourselves as social beings is in itself an educational experience of the highest value. The knowledge thus gained is essential if we are to act wisely, free from prejudice and preconceived notions, as members of society and as citizens; if we are, indeed, to "discharge the offices of life with usefulness and reputation." It is in the study of the social sciences that the mind should be trained to understand the responsibilities of the individual in the social order and that the

will should be formed to accept and carry out these responsibilities. An education which leaves its recipient content to occupy the position of a spectator, unaware or neglectful of his rightful part, has rendered small service to the recipient and none to the community. Experience in the social sciences should develop the desire and the capacity of the student for useful service. It should lead him to reconcile his freedom as an individual with his responsibilities as a member of society; to practice intelligence and honesty as civic virtues and to require them of others. Thus wrote William Penn:

The Wise Man is always for some solid good, Civil or Moral; as, to make his country more virtuous, Preserve her Peace and Liberty, Imploy her Poor, Improve Land, Advance Trade, Suppress Vice, Encourage Industry, and all Mechanik Knowledge; and that they should be the care of the Government, and the Blessing and Praise of the People.¹

IV

The humanities are still, as they have been from ancient times, the core of liberal education, but the conception of them has been vastly enlarged. The humanities deal, as I have already said, with the spiritual life and experience of men. Their field of inquiry is man's modes of thought, his religion, his ethics, his philosophy, his ideas, his means and manner of self-expression in language, in literature, and in music and the arts. The humanities deal with human cultures, and with the motives and values which animate them. They inquire into these matters throughout the long history of mankind on the earth, and they endeavor to reach conclusions as to the validity of human striving.

The disciplines and methods of the humanities are numerous and varied; they go by such names as philosophy, ethics, logic, philology and linguistics, literature, the arts, cultural anthropology, and, as an integral part of these studies as well as a discipline in its own right, history.

Five years ago, in the forefront of the discussion literature to which I have referred, there was published a report by a committee appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies, which

¹ *More Fruits of Solitude*, sections 59, 61.

bore the title *Liberal Education Re-examined: Its Rôle in a Democracy*.¹ In this report there occurs a statement (pp. 69-70) as to the rôle of the humanities which I venture to repeat:

The humanities, taken together, perform a function which justifies their being given a central place in liberal education in our democratic society. Basic to the American ideal is the belief in the value and dignity of the individual. This belief was exemplified by the earliest settlers, written into our Constitution, and zealously defended by successive generations. Our ideal of freedom is bound up with our ideal of individual integrity, for freedom has significance for us only when conceived as the freedom of individuals. To abandon the right of individual differences is for us tantamount to abandoning freedom. Anything that promotes human individuality, on the other hand, is a truly liberal or liberating agent, and hence of the greatest value to our democracy.

We have seen that morality, religion, and art engage the innermost regions of man's personality. They determine and express his thought, desires and emotions about what is most valuable in human life. They penetrate beneath mere sensation and rationalization, mere knowledge of an external world and of social phenomena, to those central experiences of value which condition human individuality and endow human life with meaning. Whoever believes in democracy must believe in the value and dignity of the individual, and whoever believes in this must believe that the disciplines which deepen and personalize human individuality should be allotted a central rôle in a liberal curriculum.

The humanities, like the social sciences, have shown concern as to whether they, too, are responsive to the methods of inquiry which have proved so startlingly successful in the natural sciences. Efforts to develop and use so-called scientific methods have not, however, been successful, with the possible exception of the study of language, or linguistics, in which a marriage of philology and anthropology has resulted in developing methods of description, analysis, and classification which can fairly be considered scientific. Application of these methods to education is bringing about far-reaching changes in the teaching and learning of foreign languages, a matter of which I should like to say more, if time permitted.

The most important effort of the humanistic disciplines, in our

¹ New York, Harper & Bros., 1943.

own country and during the last quarter century, has been directed to broadening our intellectual horizons. Until the present century little attention was paid by scholars or teachers to the experience of mankind outside the boundaries of Western Europe and the United States. A few chairs of Sanskrit were devoted almost exclusively to philological studies, but the life and thought of India were hardly touched. Some little study there was of the Far East, but most of it was at second hand, and those who were able, through command of the Chinese and Japanese languages and through competence in the methods of various disciplines, to make original constructive studies were very few indeed, and opportunity to receive instruction in these areas of study was entirely lacking. We knew little of the Near East, except for the remarkable reconstruction of its ancient civilization by means of archeological exploration, and knowledge of the great land mass of Siberia and Russia and of its peoples, beyond superficial historical accounts and the study of relatively recent and popular literature, was insignificant. Even of our neighbors to the south we were regrettably ignorant. After the First World War this condition of ignorance and half-knowledge was recognized as humiliating for scholarship and education and as dangerous for the nation; the efforts to remedy the situation and to bring those vast areas of the world, which once seemed so remote and which now we know to be so near, within the range of scholarly inquiry and eventually of education, are meeting with results which have been hastened by the experiences of the late war. We feel now, more than ever before in our history, the absolute need to know and to understand (which goes far beyond mere factual knowledge) those peoples whose modes of life and thought and whose ideas and cultural customs differ so greatly from our own that the process of knowing and understanding them calls for the highest qualities of the mind.

Recognition of this need is evidenced by the organization in many universities of so-called "area studies," the purpose of which is to examine at first hand, with the full use of necessary language and other tools and by the most effective methods of the appropriate disciplines, the areas and peoples of which we as yet know far too little.

The humanities have also recognized the importance of the inten-

sive study of ideas, of their inception, rise, dominance, and decline, and of their influence on human history. We realize now that systems of ideas, which we call ideologies, have an importance transcending that which we were accustomed to attach to geographic, economic, and political factors. Freedom of the mind finds its greatest foe in the will and power to impose ideologies and to force their acceptance. The evidences of this danger are but too present and obvious, and only the mind educated for freedom can hope to offer a successful resistance. The now famous preamble of the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) opens with the words, "Since wars begin in the minds of men it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed," and there is no greater defense than the will to freedom. Without that will, learning and literature and even the arts can be prostituted to evil purposes; the educative process can be turned into a hideous distortion and intellectual integrity can be crushed.

It is through the humanities that we gain acquaintance with the soul of man as expressed in literature and art and that the power to understand and enjoy and be inspired by those creations of the soul is achieved. The mind that does not find such enjoyment among the greatest of what Charles W. Eliot called "the enduring satisfactions" is poor indeed. But such enjoyment, to be at its full, must have an intellectual as well as a sensuous content.

The exercises of philosophy test the utmost powers of the mind in precise reflection, the use of abstract concepts, and the systematic consideration of values. The history of philosophy makes possible an understanding of the evolution and influence of systems of thought and gives background and perspective to the thought of the present, enabling us to understand it better and to judge it more adequately.

In the study of language the student develops his powers to express himself precisely and to make his meanings clear to others. In itself this is one of the most valuable exercises to which the mind can be subjected. There are few who can achieve precise self-expression without continuous and painful mental effort, and the power to sustain painful effort until the desired object has been attained is one of the most notable attributes of the educated mind.

Another closely related attribute is the power of attention. It may be expected that the educated mind will be able to read a book successfully without being first obliged to read a book on how to read a book.

But language is also a means to an end—or, to put it otherwise, it is a road which leads into regions of great charm and beauty. Our own language is, for us, a well and easily travelled road, while the languages of other people open more difficult roads and less familiar scenes, but they lead into regions equally rich in beauty. The man who cannot travel along one or more of these roads loses much that is none the less worth encountering because he is ignorant of its existence. It is hard to conceive that a truly literate person can be illiterate in all languages and literatures save his own. Nor is it possible really to enter into the lives of other peoples and to reach understanding of them by other ways than by the use of their own means of expression.

In history the student reviews the known past of mankind. His mind is trained to distinguish between fact and fiction; training in historical investigation is training in judging the reliability of evidence, and in ascertaining what actually took place. The mind well disciplined by historical inquiry is not easily led astray by rumors and hearsay and tendentious reports.

The content of history supplies the knowledge of the past without which the present is unintelligible or misunderstood, or meaningless. But even of history we must not demand too much. Some have tried to describe and interpret the whole past in terms of generalizations which should enable us to predict the future, but most historians are more modest or less confident; they feel that if history helps us to understand the present we shall be in a better position to cope with what the future may have in store.

V

I must not bring this inadequate discourse to a close without pointing out that the education of the young mind is only in part the affair of the teacher. The responsibility of the family, an institution which happily still exists even though it be an object of public anxiety, is as great as that of the school and the college.

True, the teacher must indicate the main directives, he must appraise needs and also aptitudes; he may prescribe, but he can only help to initiate a process which must continue throughout life. The mind whose education ceases with the receipt of a degree is a mind upon which it might have been as well not to expend so much and such expensive effort.

In conclusion, and by way of offering a summary of what I should have liked to say, I ask permission to quote again from the report on *Liberal Education Re-examined* (p. 120):

Would we not all agree that a person was *not* liberally educated who was illiterate and inarticulate, uninformed and with no knowledge of how to acquire knowledge, insensitive to aesthetic, moral and religious values, provincial, unintegrated, and enslaved? Does it not follow, then, that a person *is* liberally educated in proportion as he is literate and articulate in the "languages" of human intercourse, verbal, symbolic, and expressive; as he is possessed of the basic facts concerning the world of nature, human nature, and human society, and, in addition, a master of the main techniques of acquiring new knowledge in these realms; as his native sensitivity to values is cultivated and as he is capable of reflective commitment in the realms of aesthetic, moral, and religious value; as he is freed from the tyranny of provincialism through temporal, spatial, and systematic orientation—in short, as he is an intelligent and responsible agent, able to participate richly in the good life, and ready and eager to contribute all he can to the welfare of his fellow men? Is not this the positive freedom which democracy should cherish and which a liberal education should foster? And is it not our duty and privilege, as citizens, as scholars and teachers, and as human beings, to make liberal education in this country a powerful instrument for human freedom, a bulwark of human dignity, a source of human value?

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By JESSE P. BOGUE

American Association of Junior Colleges

The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education has assigned a place of importance to the community college that is destined to be a historical turning point in this concept of education. The concept itself is not new to students of American education. As far back as 1881, William W. Folwell, then President of the University of Minnesota, established short courses and institutes at the University and in rural districts in the state for instruction in agriculture and home economics. This action was taken because the people in rural districts either could not or would not attend the University for regular full-time instruction.¹ Kansas, Illinois, and Iowa had provided similar programs at earlier dates. This move to take the University to the people constituted one of the first efforts to make higher education more popular and democratic. It stated in effect that if the people cannot come to the college, we shall take the college to the people.

Moreover, President Folwell was anxious that the University should be free in offering distinctive programs of professional education. Was he the father of the 6-4-4 plan of education? Here are his words written in 1870:

A three-year Preparatory Department has been in operation since 1866 . . . It is proposed to drop, as soon as may be practicable, the first year of this Preparatory Course, and to add to the two remaining years, other two years, corresponding to the Freshman and Sophomore years of our ordinary colleges, thus forming a Department to be called "The Collegiate Department."

He then added this significant statement: "Tuition in this department to be free."² Correspondence between President Folwell

¹ *William Watts Folwell*, Autobiography, University of Minnesota Press, 1933, p. 189.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 206-207.

and Charles W. Eliot, then president of Harvard, makes interesting reading on this point of view. On August 5, 1872 Eliot wrote to Folwell as follows:

Your notion of relegating the studies of the Freshman and Sophomore years of the common American college to a "secondary" department squares with our practices and hopes.¹

It appears that both men were convinced that students in the universities were poorly prepared. The universities were burdened with such large responsibilities for preparatory work that upper division and professional education were greatly handicapped. A little later the University of Michigan was granting credit for the college Freshman year of work done in a number of selected high schools of the state.² Other advocates of the general plan to free the university for specialized and professional studies were Edmond J. James of the University of Illinois, David Starr Jordan of Leland Stanford Junior University, and especially Alexis F. Lange of the University of California. In 1916, Dr. Lange stated:

The University of California has been trying, since 1892, to reshape itself around two organizing ideas, "one and inseparable." One was and is that, for theoretical and practical considerations alike, the university proper should begin in the middle of the inherited four-year college scheme; the second was and is that the work of the first two years, as a matter of history and fact, is all of a piece with secondary education, and should, therefore, be relegated as soon and as far as practicable to secondary schools.³

It was William Rainey Harper, first President of the University of Chicago, who crystallized general concepts and gave inspiration for the establishment of the first public junior college in 1902 at Joliet, Illinois. Although Decatur Baptist College, Decatur, Texas, celebrated its half century of existence in 1947, Joliet is the oldest public junior college operating today. President Harper is regarded as the man who coined the name "junior college" and is considered by educational historians generally as the father of the movement. This is most certainly true in the sense that his or-

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 210-211.

² Eells, Walter C., *The Junior College*, Houghton Mifflin, 1931, p. 53.

³ *The Lange Book*, The Trade Publishing Co., San Francisco, p. 119.

ganizing genius was applied to the concept and that he really did something about it.

From a slow beginning in the first decade of this century, the junior college moved ahead more rapidly during the second. In the third its progress increased, with 429 institutions and nearly 68,000 students reported in 1930. The movement expanded during the depression decade to 575 colleges and 196,000 students. It slumped during the war years, especially in 1943-44, but began to pick up speed during 1945-46, so that with new and reopened colleges the number reached 648 institutions and 294,000 students. The banner record was made in the academic year of 1946-47, especially in student enrollments, reaching the all-time high of 663 colleges and over 455,000 students.

While President Harper crystallized the idea of the junior college at the beginning of this century, it was Dr. George F. Zook who was instrumental in organizing it as a real national movement in 1920. The American Association of Junior Colleges, organized in St. Louis in that year, has been beyond doubt the main national instrument that has greatly accelerated the growth in the number of the junior colleges, their expansion in enrollments, clarification of objectives, improvement in methods and personnel, legal status, financial support and the general understanding of the movement on the part of the public.

II

Now comes the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. We predict that for the junior college movement this Report will be as significant in many respects as was the clarification of the idea by President Harper and the organization of the movement by Dr. Zook. This prediction is based on the following considerations:

First, higher education is approached from the point of view of its essential significance *nationally*. "Higher Education for American Democracy" is the arresting main title to the series of studies.¹

¹ This Report, published in six volumes, may be secured from the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., as follows:

Vol. I, Establishing the Goals, 103 pp., \$0.40.

Vol. II, Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity, 69 pp., \$0.35.

Vol. III, Organizing Higher Education, 74 pp., \$0.30.

Vol. IV, Staffing Higher Education, 63 pp., \$0.25.

Vol. V, Financing Higher Education, 68 pp., \$0.25.

Vol. VI, Resource Data, 51 pp., \$0.50.

While a Federal system of education appears to be far removed from the thinking of the Commission, a system of education within the Nation designed on a functional basis is emphasized strongly. The Report is not the first to stress the inequalities of education within the United States. Many others have done the same thing.¹ The Commission, however, appointed by the President of the United States and supported by national funds for its historic work, tends to give increased importance to the demand that equal opportunities for education at all levels must be a basic inheritance of all the people of this Nation as a *policy of national welfare*. The element of urgency is included. "In a sense the future of our civilization depends on the direction education takes, not just in the distant future, but in the days immediately ahead."² This spirit of the Report lifts it from an academic discussion to a fighting manifesto on a national level. That the job can be done and must be done is emphasized by its repetition, as well as by a financial analysis of our ability to meet the costs.

It has, therefore, focused *national* attention on the problems of education and especially higher education. Perhaps no one knows yet the extent to which the Report has been publicized. From press clippings of news stories and editorial comment gathered so far, it appears that publicity has been wider and more favorable than on any other report ever made on education. The ultimate force and value of this fact for national attention, discussion and thinking and, let us hope, for national resolve, makes the Report even now one of unusual significance and power in directing public opinion.

On the day the first release was made in December, 1947, the writer was appearing before an Interim Committee on Education of one of our states relative to community colleges. The impact of the Report was immediate and electrifying. We felt that we had been surrounded by a "great cloud of witnesses." No longer was

¹ "Education—An Investment in People," Committee on Education, U. S. Chamber of Commerce, 1945, Washington, D. C.; "Unfinished Business in American Education," Norton and Lawler, 1944, National Education Association and American Council on Education; "Inventory of Public School Expenditures in the United States," Norton and others, 2 vols., 1944, American Council on Education; Report of President's Advisory Committee on Education, 1938, Government Printing Office.

² *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 7.

a single state deciding the destinies of its educational plans as an individual and isolated concern. In a vital sense its decisions would be reflected in the judgments of the whole Nation. In the light of national thinking and publicity, colleges, universities, and state systems of education must now decide their destinies and policies before the enlightened judgment of the people.

Second, higher education is approached from the standpoint of its functional unity on a *state-wide* basis. Functional unity of education within a state is not to be misunderstood as an exclusively unified state system. The two are as different as are day and night. Stronger and better financed state leadership, greater freedom of education from political party influences, a consideration of all types of sound education to make for variety but within unity and completeness should be the goal for the several states. In this general plan the community college concept takes a prominent place. As far as the public institution is concerned, there is no reason why the funds of a state should be used for one community or group of people unless they are available on exactly the same terms for all similar communities and groups within the state. Thus, a working blueprint for the *entire state*, embracing the co-operation of all legitimate institutions under whatever type of control, becomes the logical and equitable plan. Just as national thinking influences the direction of education within the several states, so does state-wide planning influence and determine to a large extent the direction of education in the communities within the states.

The community college and the independent junior college, under a state plan, fall into a natural pattern in relation to all education. No longer is the program of the 13th and 14th years of education to be thought of merely as a dome of secondary education, nor even as the capstone of public education, much less a dead-end program of so-called "terminal" education. The greater significance of the community college concept, as of all phases of education, lies in the fact that it opens more and broader intellectual highways for students and adults to choose and advance in to the limits of their native abilities and interests. Through the community college education becomes a continuous process, each step to be followed by others in natural succession for further education

in college, university, or professional school, or into skilled employment, better home life, and the larger responsibilities of the good citizen. No longer is the community college to be strangled by the magic of numbers, merely a two-year program. If it is to be a community college in fact as well as in name, its doors must be open to the people of the community regardless of adult age, and its offerings must be as broad as the best interests of the community that may be served by education and training. The flow of students from the community college into more advanced forms of education must be based on student knowledge and ability rather than on rigid course requirements, credit hours, unreasonable sequence of studies and set patterns in curricula. Continuity and completeness of education may be achieved on a functional basis, and the Commission is to be thanked for bringing out the necessity for greater fluidity in the advancement of students from the community college into other levels of education.

At this point there is great need for closer cooperation and coordination of efforts and programs between junior and senior colleges. Plans should and can be made for better integration of course offerings in both types of institutions. If it is advisable for junior colleges and high schools to integrate their programs, it is equally desirable for the same process to be extended upward from the junior to the senior college. Perhaps the interest today in general education may ultimately result in the junior college assuming greater responsibility for this program. On the basis of this more comprehensive design for general studies, concentration in the university could begin easily and naturally. Michigan State College now requires all students to take five courses of general education out of a total of seven being offered in the Basic College Program. If a similar plan should be more generally adopted, the junior college could provide for this program of foundation studies. Thus the process of advancement into upper division work would become smoother and more fluid than is the case at present.

Recently, plans were initiated at a work conference in one of our states to provide a blueprint for a closely coordinated system of education embracing the junior and senior institutions. One of the aims of this plan is the creation of greater fluidity in the transfer of

junior college graduates into the senior colleges and the state universities. In the final analysis readjustments in prerequisite requirements and sequence courses will be made by both the junior and senior institutions. Leaders in agricultural education in that state contend that an expanded program of general education is needed with a minimum of specific course requirements in technical education during the first two college years. Three additional conferences for state-wide planning for the further solution of the problems of coordination of work have been held during the spring of 1948. Leaders in nursing education are interested in a national plan to bring about closer integration between pre-professional studies in the junior college and professional studies in schools of nursing. While certain prerequisite studies of a specialized nature in the junior college are necessary for the nursing curriculum, general education may play a more important rôle in the future than it has in the past.

The time has come when something definite must be done. The almost chaotic systems existing in various institutions in respect to university curricula requirements create many and very difficult problems for junior colleges. In some junior colleges three or four different prerequisite plans must be provided in a single curriculum. Even in mathematics requirements may vary in different institutions from a course of six hours to another of eight and still a third of ten. Around-the-table planning can be done to reach common understandings and greater uniformity of plans. Senior institutions could accelerate the plan by adopting among themselves more uniform programs of education in various curricula. If we will keep our eyes on the student and make our plans on a cooperative basis, the progressive steps in his educational advancement will fall into a natural and fluid pattern integrated all along the line.

Third, higher education is approached on the basis of its function to meet the needs of the local community, in the community and essentially for the people who live and work in the community. Too often, some forms of higher education have functioned in the manner described in the Montana studies:

A college, it has been said, is one of the best ways to kill a small

town, if the college has no community orientation. By fostering urban-centered values, suburban values, career values focused in individual ambition, it becomes a drainage ditch down which many of the more energetic youngsters of the community float, never to return.¹

The philosophy of the community college for America takes on something of the flavor of the folk-schools of Scandinavian countries and the county colleges in England. Their primary purpose is to enrich the quality of community living in order to enable the people to enjoy the fruits of their labors. The community college does not exist for the sake of the university, nor to produce efficient workers as tools in an industrialized society, nor further, to keep money in local communities that might be spent by students in other college centers. Increasing emphasis is being placed on general education in the social sciences and the humanities as an indispensable part of the community college program for all students, regardless of their vocational aims. Hereby, an enriched and enlarged personality may be gained by means of and within the framework of democratic government. This is the goal. The social ends to be gained by vocational training on the college level are to be kept in mind. Even this type of education is not planned in the community college to create docile adjustment to community environment, but rather to help develop the skills and critical faculties whereby persons may intelligently analyze their physical, economic, and social environment and give to them the power and will to change and reconstruct it. The worker as a citizen must have insight to evaluate and appreciate the far reaching social and economic implications of his labor. The worker today is no longer a "man with a hoe," even though the hoe has become a modern tractor. He must be imbued with cultural desires and interests for his ever-increasing leisure time. While our American Constitution provides for the largest personal freedom to the individual compatible with the welfare of society, the right kind, amount of and opportunity for education is the only way the citizen can achieve full freedom as his own heritage. Hence, all artificial barriers to educational opportunity must be removed.

¹ Baker Brownell, "The College and the Community," *Journal of Higher Education*, June, 1946, p. 295.

An equal chance for education for every American child must become a settled democratic policy in this Nation. The barriers of geography, economic status, sex, race, creed, and color must all be removed from the path of American youth.

Fourth, community and junior colleges will advance when better methods of finance are provided for them. In a number of states the junior college is almost an educational and financial orphan. There is too often little or no supervision from any source outside the community and no funds except those raised by local taxes and student tuitions. In some states, financial support for the college is confined strictly within the borders of the high-school district. In many cases funds are altogether inadequate, especially at a reasonable tax rate. Provision must be made for enlarged community college districts (where they are needed), their establishment approved by a state board, standards, regular inspection and proper supervision provided, state aid and equalization funds appropriated and Federal aid made available to equalize the programs as between the states and for grants to enable the development of vocational programs similar to present provisions to land-grant colleges and vocational education in the secondary schools. The common people in a number of states have outstripped their state governments and departments of education in organizing and operating junior colleges, even though many of them are too small and poorly supported to be adequate for community needs. The influence and prestige of the President's Commission will add greatly to the weight of arguments advanced for years for better financing of the community college. If and when other states take action similar to legislation now in effect and in the making in California, Washington, Utah, Texas, and Mississippi, and only then, will the community college fulfill its rightful place in American education. Even this type of legislation must be supplemented in a number of states by Federal funds, and in all states vocational education of college grade is to be encouraged.

In some states, extension centers and technical institutes may meet community needs, but only in cases where the State University is aware of the unique concept of the community college, where the largest possible local autonomy is permitted and where the institution can take on the flavor of community thinking and plan-

ning as well as a measure of community support. The Commission has avoided advocating any one particular type of institution or state system. Further research and practical experience are needed before final word can be given as to the best types of colleges and state systems. It is recognized, however, that a true community college must have the enthusiastic interest and active participation of the community itself. If extension centers are to be instituted, the parent university must beware of the many shortcomings of absentee educational landlordism.

American education moves best in a series of concentric circles of responsibility and support, each doing its full share: the community first, then the state, and finally the Nation. From the resources within each circle, the fullest possible measure of financial support should be given and the largest possible degree of autonomy exercised. The community should expect the state to do only those things which the state can do better than can be done in and by the community. The state in turn should look to the Nation for financial assistance and educational leadership only to the extent dictated by necessity. Within this general framework local pride and leadership may be developed and exercised, education kept responsive to community needs, the rights of states safeguarded, and greater assurances given for the preservation of democratic ideals and practices.

III

There has now been placed in our hands another instrument by means of which public thinking and action may be stimulated. The American Association of Junior Colleges, meeting in Kansas City, Missouri, February 24-27, 1948, unanimously resolved to carry out studies on the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education in conferences under the leadership of the several regional associations. Information is to be given to all junior colleges regarding the progress of this plan and the manner in which individual junior colleges may implement studies of the Report. Summer conferences, workshops, and regular courses of study in the field of the junior college should give large consideration to the Report. Already some junior colleges are holding faculty meet-

ings for the specific purpose of making a critical analysis of the Report. Perhaps a syllabus should be prepared as a guide for a series of faculty meetings in junior colleges. Institutions offering adult education could use the Report as the basis for a course of study, either with or without credit. In any event, the real value of the Report will be in the extent of its understanding by the citizens of the country, the degree of common convictions regarding its implications, and the resolves made by our citizens that these implications shall result in appropriate action.

SCIENCE AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT¹

The Case for a National Science Foundation

By Ralph W. Gerard

The University of Chicago

Why should this subject merit discussion before a group of academicians? The answer lies in the use of two words by Winston Churchill, a major world statesman, in his 1940 Quebec address, "At the end of the war, the whole world may turn with hope, *with science*, [emphasis supplied] with good sense and dearly bought experience from war to lasting peace." The answer lies in the atomic bomb, in Grand Coulee dam, in the near abolition of typhoid fever, in nylon. Whether we like it or not, science is now in the big-time circuit and is there to stay. It is, perhaps, the major national resource, in peace no less than war. At present its importance is mainly at the technological level, in terms of know-how, as applied in industry. It should be similarly important in terms of public education: education of citizens to the rational consideration of human problems, as of the simpler ones of the material world.

We should really consider, then, the proper relations between government and science in the areas of teaching and of research; and these, further, in terms of basic research and liberal education, contributing to the culture of a people, on the one hand, and of applied research and technological education, contributing to the productive potential and power of the nation, on the other. Moreover, there are the separate facets of the use of science and scientists by government, and of government support of nongovernmental science activities. Only some of these matters can be considered in the available time and I propose to center the discussion on what scientists should want of and offer to the Federal Government.

¹ Addresses presented at the Thirty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors, St. Louis, Missouri, February 27, 1948.

The present picture has been limned in by the Steelman¹ report to the President. Though produced hurriedly and admittedly based often on estimates, its figures are probably reasonably correct. There are in this country some 140,000 scientists, of whom 25,000 have the Ph.D. Roughly 50,000 of the total are now in universities and like institutions, 60,000 in industry, and 30,000 in government employ. These numbers are far from filling present needs, and, despite some 400,000 science students (not including 200,000 in engineering) now being trained, the war deficit will increase until 1953. Even now there is a shortage of 15,000 science teachers, which will diminish; and of 100,000 science bachelors, which will increase. The expected maximum deficit of Ph.D.'s will reach 8000. Clearly, government support for education is essential, and clearly opportunities for scientists are great.

On the financial side, the support of science is increasing prodigiously. The total spent in this country in 1930 was, in millions, \$150, of which 12%, or \$18, went for basic research rather than technological development. During the war the total jumped to \$600, but only 2% of this, or \$12, was allocated to basic research. The figures for 1947 again rise for the total, to \$1000, and also for basic research, 4% or \$40. The recommended future expenditure for science is 1% of the national income, or \$2000 at present, of which one fourth, \$500, should flow into basic research. With the rocketing of total funds has gone a sharp change in sources. The increases have come overwhelmingly from government and industry, not from increased resources of academic institutions. Private philanthropy has become a trickle in the torrent, and all forces seem to be operating to further the trend.

There is more science in our future, an ever-growing rôle and need for it in our culture. Science as a training for specialists now occupies a considerable portion of higher education; but the recognition of its greater importance in liberal education will lead to greatly extended science teaching at all educational levels. In government, also, the use of science and scientists is on the increase. Not only do existing research units need more staff but new ones are being created which are concerned more and more with basic re-

¹ John R. Steelman, "A Report to the President, Science and Public Policy," August 27, 1947, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

search problems, ones underlying defense, agriculture, transportation, industry. And as human affairs become more intricate and dependent on special knowledge, so are scientists called more urgently into policy-forming posts and consultations. They must advise on atomic energy, on mechanized warfare, on natural resources, on new inventions, on housing and health.

Nor are these services limited to the national level. In international affairs as well, organs have been created which demand the participation of scientists. Important scientists are on the staffs of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the World Health Organization; scientific attachés and missions are moving between countries; exchange of professors and students, as under the Fulbright bill, will include many in science. And the growing use of scientists in industry need only be mentioned.

Yet with these increased demands for scientists comes the increased cost of their training and activities. The easy observations and experiments have largely been made and the frontier of the unknown is more distant from our simple senses. So, more powerful, and expensive instruments are required—to see further into the atom or the heavens, to measure fewer electrons or photons, to calculate with more variables. At the same time, these complex instruments require finer expertness to devise and operate, and their yield of information demands more special knowledge to interpret. As many approaches are focused on a problem few men, indeed, now find themselves in sufficient mastery of the various ones. So research teams are becoming more necessary and common, especially after the experiences of cooperative scientific effort during the war.

All scientists are aware of the need for more financial support of science, and for more trained workers in science; and many know both the need and desirability of more effective coordination. I remind you that the really seminal discoveries and insights result from the efforts of a handful of men. The great bulk of scientists works to lay the highways of knowledge into the new territories after the pioneer has shown their existence and broken trail. For most of these useful workers, cooperative effort is no circumscrip-

tion but, as many found even under trying war conditions, is often a positive gain and a greater satisfaction.

II

Such are the opportunities, needs, and conditions. How are they to be met, what are the sources of support for universities and like institutions? The familiar ones are notoriously drying up. Interest rates have fallen as endowments rose. The purchasing power of the dollar has shrunk and the total purchasing power required has expanded. Large gifts decrease as large fortunes are more heavily taxed, small gifts from friends and alumni, even large ones, are lost in the cavern of annual budgets of ten or twenty million a year at the great universities. Even the old stand-bys, the foundations, are working with devalued and decreased capital and few new ones of large means are being created. A possible exception and important source of growing support is the group of voluntary health agencies such as the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis or American Cancer Society, supported by national public fund-raising campaigns. Patents on the fruits of their own scientific work would soon make universities self-supporting, but might put them in undesirable competition in a business atmosphere, and most universities have foresworn this source of income. Today the universities are impoverished compared to a quarter century ago. They are really insolvent and carry on only with the aid of funds from industry and especially from government. State and federal funds have supported science in this country for the past decade. If government aid were suddenly withdrawn, I have little doubt that our major educational institutions would collapse. The plain fact is, then, that at present and for the foreseeable future basic science must look to government for support, abetted to some degree by industry; and ever more to the Federal Government. This is not to say that private support may be neglected. Even if quantitatively small, such private funds and institutions must continue, as in the past, to pioneer in administrative and educational experiments. The best will always help set the standards for the bulk of more routinely supported institutions.

The situation is not without its dangers, which have been widely

heralded and sometimes exaggerated. Regimentation and red tape are not unknown in government activities. War research was sometimes closely directed, even by men with little scientific awareness, and minute accounting and reporting requirements harassed nearly all scientists serving the government. But such liabilities are not inevitable, have caused concern, and are being ameliorated. New bills dealing with scientific activity have mostly given explicit escape from these annoyances.

If government supports research scientists by jobs in its ranks or funds outside them, there are other potential dangers: of diverting an excessive proportion of able men from teaching, by the lure of research facilities at other institutions; of siphoning too much of the cream of young manhood into science as a whole, due to greater opportunities, so that other important needs—for humanists, statesmen, writers,—are not met; of concentrating research effort in certain fields, at the expense of others in science, by disproportionate support which will attract opportunists and support the work-learn training of advanced students accepting such specialties; of fostering mediocrity in scientific leadership, though this would hardly be on a financial basis, government and academic salaries being what they are; of diverting the whole course of research from the basic long-range effort, which maintains the water table but is rarely in the headlines, to practical short-range jobs, which flourish on the water and blossom into particular accomplishments that Congress and the citizenry understand.

There is also the danger—with classified research results, restricted interchange of knowledge, often ill-advised loyalty tests, even open witch hunting—of a blackout of the very soul of science and of the effectiveness or consciences of scientists. But this problem transcends that of science; it affects science privately pursued at universities only less than that under government aegis, and its resolution is up to the good sense and democratic wisdom of the American people.

It is well to be aware of dangers and to attempt to forestall them; it is not wise merely to point with alarm without examining the actual facts and the alternate conditions. Most of the apprehensions concerning government support apply equally to support from industry, some even more realistically, yet heavy contributions

from industry are sought and welcomed; and, as pointed out earlier, either government or industry *must* carry the load of scientific subsidies. Even foundation grants, which all have praised for their fertilizing action on research, have carried the danger, to some extent the actuality, of luring able men into science and scientists into particular fields of investigation. Conversely, it is simply not true that all government-administered science suffers from the many possible defects mentioned.

Many state universities in this country are now in the front rank. Their academic staffs, freedom of operation, devotion to sound scholarship and significant research place several of these on a par with leading private institutions. Educational standards and practices, at many levels, have been enviable under the governmental agency, the New York Board of Regents. I have recently returned from Australia where I found the federal agency, the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, operating splendidly. Although created actually to produce practical results, the council supports extensive pure research, and the scientists in its employ tend to work with better conditions, salaries, and contentment than most of their counterparts in the universities. Finally let me mention the Office of Naval Research as an example of what research administered directly by our own Federal Government, yes, even a military branch of it, can be like.

Many scientists, like myself, made proposals for ONR contracts a couple of years back, with our fingers crossed. We were a bit tired of the petty bookkeeping problems, the interminable reports, the classified handling of information, the pressure for particular studies, the need for practical orientation that we had all experienced during the war years. But we did make proposals and many received contracts. Since then we have worked with the ONR officers as contractors and a few of us as advisors as well. I can report without reservation not only my own experience but that of all others with whom I have spoken (limited to the Medical Division). There has been an irreducible minimum of red tape and paper work, less than for the usual foundation grant; there has been friendly aid always available; there has been no secrecy and no inquisition; investigators have been allowed complete freedom in the prosecution of their research, and immediate or dramatically useful results

have not been expected. The ONR has even taken the wise position that practical research is best conducted in its own facilities and that it prefers to support basic studies at the universities, and I can assert that contracts are awarded on the basis of such valid criteria as the scientific significance of the problem. The ONR is, in fact, in part attempting to hold the line of university science between the demise of the war agency, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and the birth of a peace agency, the National Science Foundation.

III

A bill to create a National Science Foundation is before Congress as I write. Such a foundation is desired by 99 per cent of the scientists of this country, according to the poll of the Intersociety Committee on a National Science Foundation. It is desired so much that 86 per cent would find any of the proposed administrative organizations acceptable, even though scientist opinion as to the preferred set-up was as widely split as was that in governmental circles. This is really an impressive agreement when placed against the fact that only a third—of natural scientists, mind you!—considered a foundation that would exclude social science as acceptable. Whether passed by this Congress or a later one and initiated under this administration or a later one, a National Science Foundation will come into being. The scientists want it, the institutions of higher learning need it, the welfare of our country demands it. The dangers inherent in greater participation by the Federal Government in the support of science are not to be met by abrogating this support but by other positive measures.

Scientists, good scientists, must be willing to help in planning and administering the government's activities in science. They must be willing to give up some of their own productive activity to do a needed job—and their scientific colleagues must learn to respect them for doing so. Good scientists must be willing to work in government institutions. Even now salaries and facilities in these are often superior to those in academic positions, but there is still legitimate hesitancy as to freedom of research and stability of support. Congress has had a devastating habit of suddenly cutting the budget from under great governmental institutions.

This suggests the other positive action required of scientists. We must continue to educate the public, and Congress, to the meaning and importance of basic research—the research in which you *don't* find what you're looking for. All scientists know that this is harder to do, more demanding of high ability, more rewarding in the long run, and incomparably more important to the ultimate welfare of the country and the world than is applied research. When Congress, as elected by an informed people, fully realizes what a priceless resource is a body of active, imaginative investigators and at what a relative pittance it can be fostered and maintained, there will be no danger of sudden cuts in research budgets. In depression periods research will be the last item to remain, not the first to be cut, for from it will come the new industries and the new prosperity. And scientists will cast their lot with government research, secure in their freedom to follow the ideas that come and in the continuing means to do so.

Because science is becoming recognized as a prime resource in war and peace, because the changing character of research and of our institutions requires it, because the whole direction of social evolution is toward greater functioning of the federal (and some day world) government, it is inevitable that the Federal Government will support science on an increasing scale. Our opportunity is to guide this stream into the most useful channels so that research and teaching are maximally irrigated and minimally watered down.

The Case against a National Science Foundation¹

By Theodore Koppányi

Georgetown University

The Federal Government has recognized the importance of research in the field of natural sciences for almost a century. That is what President Lincoln had in mind when in 1863 he asked Congress to grant a charter for the National Academy of Sciences to advise responsible government agencies as to the application of scientific discoveries, possibly with a view to terminating success-

¹ Cf., also, by Professor Koppányi, "Some Reflections on the Progress of Science and the Magnuson-Kilgore Bill," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Winter, 1945, pp. 681-696.

fully the war between the States. During the Spanish-American War the application of scientific results to problems of war was at a low ebb, with somewhat disastrous results. During World War I the National Research Council was founded, and many scientists were drafted and given commissions in the Army and Navy to carry out researches which would prove helpful in winning the War.

In World War II the drafting of civilian scientists and the awarding of contracts to them to carry out certain special problems was done on a very large scale, and several government agencies, particularly the Office of Scientific Research and Development, were instrumental in awarding such contracts and coordinating the work of the contractors. I am not criticizing the O.S.R.D. or any similar military or civilian agency. These organizations did a very fine job very effectively and, according to the then President of the National Academy of Sciences, very expensively. The expense was justified by a national emergency. However, it was true even at the time of that great emergency (and I am quoting an unbiased opinion by Lord Brabazon of Tara, British Minister of Aircraft Production in the Churchill War Cabinet) that "the idea that there should be two classes of men of science, one knowing government secrets and research work, and those outside the sacred fold, was, and is, a very shocking proposal."

No one can criticize the basic idea that war and national defense need the cooperation of competent scientists. No one can dispute the right, nay, even the duty, of the Department of National Defense to ask qualified research workers to attempt to solve certain problems that appear important from a military point of view. And we might as well be fairly liberal in our interpretation of what military needs are.

The Federal Government has also established during its long history other types of government research agencies that have served the government in assisting citizens with their everyday problems and in protecting them against such harm as the Federal Government considered to be the concern of a central authority. I need mention only the Food and Drug Administration, the Bureau of Standards, the Bureau of Mines, the various bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, the Forest Service, the

Geological Survey, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and, of course, the U. S. Public Health Service. These agencies, in addition to other activities, carry out original, mostly applied research work which is usually of great and immediate consequence to the citizenry of this country or to a section thereof. A sample of what actually has been accomplished is ably described in a fine book recently published by the University of Oklahoma Press, "Two Blades of Grass," by T. Swann Harding. The author shows what type of research a government agency should and did accomplish. The scientists of the Department of Agriculture developed rust-proof wheat and better fruits and vegetables, and, in general, made improved farming possible.

All this indicates that our government has always been aware of the importance of research as far as it concerns practical problems of war and peace, and the accomplishments of the various government agencies and their consultants amply justify the government's position.

The more recent idea of establishing an intergovernmental research agency to coordinate research in various scientific bureaus of the Federal Government, mainly to avoid duplication of work and insure frequent consultations and cooperation between different scientific agencies and individual scientists in federal employ, is a practical one provided it is not carried to an extreme. As far as the membership of the American Association of University Professors is concerned, I am sure that we unanimously approve of the general mechanics of the government research set-up, although we may criticize some of the details. We do not and cannot have any quarrel with the legitimate government research program in war and in peace to insure national security and promote the public welfare.

II

Quite a different research program is in process of being forced upon the Federal Government by well-meaning people, mostly scientists and statesmen who are persuaded by their scientific friends that such a program is extremely desirable if not absolutely necessary. They maintain categorically that the Federal Government is obligated to foster pure research and applied research, not

only in times of war but also in peace. Thus far, this responsibility has been shared by universities, independent research institutions, and scientific industrial laboratories. It is alleged that it is the sacred obligation of the government to support all kinds of worthwhile, pure or applied research, since any research carried out competently will ultimately benefit every citizen, and may be of incalculable value to the government in the performance of its war and peacetime activities.

This is a dangerous doctrine. It is tantamount to saying that scientific discoveries are more important than any other human endeavor in war and in peace. Obviously, few people would agree with this view. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that many of the research problems, in fact the vast majority of them, will ever become of practical significance from the point of view of national defense or public welfare. Hitherto, research activities, with the exception of those of special concern to the government, have been carried out by university and privately endowed laboratories. What, then, has happened between 1942 and 1946 that has led so many scientists and politicians in this country to believe that the government should subsidize pure and applied research by awarding contracts to scientists who present attractive blueprints of specific research programs? Has the nation been impoverished to such an extent that universities and industry can no longer support the researches of their faculty, graduate students, or staff members? I understand that the enrollment in all colleges is the highest in the history of the country; that educational institutions have raised tuition fees; and that there is as yet no depression to reduce the return on their investments. Industry can take care of itself. During the panic of the early thirties, a demand for federal support of research would have been far more timely and logical.

Should it be necessary to supplement budgets of educational institutions, there is another bill before the country which proposes that such institutions receive general federal support to the amount of two billion dollars. Several states propose to enact similar legislation. Still the clamor for a National Science Foundation becomes louder and louder.

The net result of the propaganda for a National Science Foundation is a chain of events that already should be of utmost concern to

the academic profession. Several government agencies are already parceling out contracts to individual scientists who have submitted research problems for approval to the several committees of these agencies. There is already a competition between departments and between members within departments of several universities to secure as many grants as possible. In the first place, some of these grants carry tremendous overhead expense accounts which usually go to the general fund of the university, and, in the second place, the "residual" grant releases the university from the obligation of supporting research in its various departments. It is obvious, therefore, that the fair-haired boys of the administrations will be the scientists who secure bigger and better grants. It is also obvious that the verdicts of the government agencies will remain no secret among the college authorities, and fingers will be pointed at those unfortunate individuals who fail to obtain grants and who are rejected without being told the reasons for rejection. The American Association of University Professors already has documentary evidence that several of these unfavored faculty members are experiencing difficulties.

The present practice of handing out research contracts to deserving individuals is only in an embryonic stage. With the establishment of a National Science Foundation, this will become the usual procedure, and every faculty member engaged in scientific activity in this country will be under scrutiny by the college authorities—how well is he getting on with the National Science Foundation? I envision a mad scramble, maneuvering for position, jealousy, and long-winded explanations for failure. These activities may very well take up more time than the actual performance of worth-while scientific experiments.

Now, if the National Science Foundation and other government organizations were to follow the example set by the good old Agricultural Adjustment Administration and pass out checks for abstaining from research activity, perhaps both editors and readers of scientific periodicals as well as other individuals and institutions might well be pleased. I fear, however, that such a rational procedure will not be followed, and the "merits" and "demerits" of research projects will be judged grimly by standards I cannot even suspect. I, personally, could not feel capable of judging or pre-

dicting the success of any research project unless it were wholly the idea of a crank. If it is difficult and perilous to estimate the value of research work already accomplished, what a hopeless task it would be to pass judgment on research to be done in the future! Since this is admittedly impossible to do, the awarding of contracts must be done largely on a personal basis. I do not imply anything improper, but it seems reasonable to assume that the applicants who are unknown, or have not the confidence of the Committee awarding the contracts, will not be among the successful competitors for grants. In any case, the various boards awarding contracts will have to use judgment about persons and laboratories, and the members of our Association, particularly those trained in philosophy, know what to think of value judgments. No one knows how far these things might carry, if the present and the projected method of awarding individual contracts is erected into a permanent system.

Like Drew Pearson, I should like to indulge in a prediction, that if the National Science Foundation becomes a reality, members of the academic profession will live to regret it; a few probably for personal reasons, and many because of their concept of research and its place in human society.

The pressure brought upon university faculties is already heavy enough, but the establishment of a National Science Foundation would add considerably to the burden. If the government can spend billions of dollars in Europe, it might also be a wise long-range program to invest in the Nation's accredited educational institutions of higher learning. But let them not split faculties, set faculties against administrations, administrations against faculties, because the net result will be general unhappiness with less research done than ever before.

Some friends in the Association have asked me to comment on similar European schemes, and to examine our program of federal support of research in the light of past European experience. Having spent all of my adult life in this country, I have unfortunately no special knowledge of recent European developments. It is known to me, as it probably is to most members of the profession, that the vast majority of continental European universities and research institutions are owned and operated by the

State and, at least in peacetime, *individual scientists* receive no special government support for their work.

I have learned a great deal, however, from a recently published, rather interesting book by Frederic Lilge, "The Abuse of Learning: The Failure of the Franco-Prussian War." Lilge explains that after the Franco-Prussian War the Germans became very much impressed with technological progress; the belief in the omnipotence of science and scientists became widespread, and the idealistic conception of general education receded into the background. The emphasis on science as the salvation of mankind created a human vacuum and a neglect of the true humanitarian bases of broad, general, cultural education. Lilge assumes, rightly or wrongly, that the ill fate which was in store for Germany may be traced to these ideas.

Atomic bomb and penicillin production on a commercial scale during the War emboldened certain scientists to demand huge federal subsidies for research. They had considerable public support. If they are not careful, however, a public reaction is bound to follow.

University teachers know better than anybody else that great and true science can thrive only on a broad, cultural, and humanitarian foundation. If science is deprived of this foundation, it may still produce atomic bombs, and possibly new chemotherapeutic remedies, but not great fundamental discoveries which are the result of devout and, if you will, patient inquiry. This spirit and mood of inquiry inspires the academic youth and makes for the development of fine scientists and great men. Freedom of inquiry based on a solid cultural and moral foundation rather than on a National Science Foundation is the result of centuries of struggle and suffering and was achieved at a tremendous cost. Its preservation appears more important in safeguarding the continuance of scientific inquiry than the selection of prospective scientists on a highly competitive and regional basis.

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND SOCIAL POLICY

By ROBERT BIERSTEDT

University of Illinois

Physicists, financiers, and philosophers, publicists, politicians, and poets have all had something to say about the atomic bomb, about the international control of atomic energy, and about the possibilities and potentialities of a durable world peace. The physicists in particular have conferred in private and argued in public, have issued sober reports and impassioned pleas, and have properly harangued the populace at large. Some of them have formed federations to advise on these problems, some have assumed the unfamiliar rôle of lobbyists, and still others serve on official committees and commissions of the Government. Where, in all of these councils, are the persons who presumably know most about the processes of society? Where are the scientists who study social organization and social change? Where, in short, are the social scientists? And what is their relation to social policy?

It cannot be denied that in all of these colloquies sociologists have been conspicuously silent. Neither as individuals, with some exceptions, nor as members of professional groups, have they had anything to say about the most distressing issues of our time. The American Sociological Society has drafted no resolutions on questions of public policy. Nothing has been said by that organization about the impact of atomic technologies upon society, nothing about the social implications of atomic energy, and nothing about growing tensions in any part of the world. If the physicists are terrified, the military apprehensive, and the politicians nonplused, why are the sociologists indifferent? Why do they hesitate to contribute their recommendations to a world which stands in sore need of all the knowledge it can have in the field of human relations?

These are far from idle questions, especially in view of James Bryant Conant's recent presidential address to the American

Association for the Advancement of Science. If sociology has nothing to contribute to society, there would seem to be little reason to encourage its continued practice. University departments of sociology can of course train students to do what is called "research." They can teach all of the accepted techniques for polling public opinion, surveying a community, predicting success or failure in marriage, extrapolating population trends, shuffling Hollerith cards, and—in H. L. Mencken's notorious phrase—counting the privies in Pittsburgh. But what does it profit us to be able to discover that persons who are best acquainted with the issues of a political campaign are least likely to change their allegiance from one political party to another, that second children have a higher expectancy of success in their marriages than first or only children, that church attendance increases during depressions and during wars, and other conclusions of a similar nature? No matter what the intrinsic importance of these inquiries, and no one would deny that they have a great deal, they would seem to have little to do with the basic principles which determine the structure of society and the basic conditions of social change. What does knowledge of this kind contribute to a troubled world?

Does it help us to know, to cite one of the most admired pieces of sociological research conducted in recent years, that the distance people move at a given time is directly proportional to the number of opportunities at that distance and inversely proportional to the number of intervening opportunities? What do sociological laws like this have to do with the social order that we desperately require if we are not to perish as victims of the poisonous mushroom that grew in the sky above Hiroshima and Nagasaki and Bikini?

II

In order to suggest an answer to these questions it is necessary to recognize at the outset that some of them proceed from an inadequate knowledge of the nature of the sociological enterprise. The relationship between sociology and social policy is a complicated one and requires for its analysis some understanding of the rules and methods of science. For sociology is, or at least tries to be, a science. And science as such can have nothing immediately to do

with policy. Sociologists as scientists, therefore, are not the saviors of society. In spite of a history which was linked in part with problems of social welfare—poverty, unemployment, crime, delinquency, and other kinds of social pathology—sociology is neither a substitute nor a synonym for social reform. Nor, in addition, are sociologists publicists, and they have far fewer recommendations about the direction which our American society ought to take and about the way human relations, including international relations, ought to be directed than have the columnists who speak with such authority and omniscience in the daily newspapers. If sociologists hesitate to give advice on problems of domestic and foreign policy, if they are chary of anything that even vaguely resembles a recommendation on matters of social and political action, it is for reasons which have seemed clear and cogent to them. These reasons it is profitable to explore, in an endeavor first to re-examine their cogency and second to inquire into possible limitations upon their relevance.

All of these reasons concern the fact, suggested above, that sociology, as distinguished from all other approaches to the human scene from the literary to the philosophic, is a science. It is a science or it is nothing. And in order to be a science it must diligently avoid all pronouncements of an ethical character. As a science it cannot answer questions of value. It can have no traffic with normative statements because there is no logic of the normative. It can deal, as can the other sciences, only with questions of fact, with propositions, with statements capable of being true or false. It cannot deal with questions of good or bad, better or worse, right or wrong, or any question at all containing the word "ought." The sociologist, in company with his brother scientists, has taken seriously the famous remark of Jeremy Bentham, that the word "ought" ought never to be used, except in saying it ought never to be used.

This nonethical or non-normative character of science is indeed one of its primary characteristics, along with objectivity, communicability, verifiability, and relativity. The scientific method as such provides no technique for answering questions of value, for determining ultimate ends, for weighing the merits of an ethical or political controversy, for deciding what, if anything, ought to be

done as a matter of social policy. Perhaps no better illustration of this principle can be offered than the story of the renowned Columbia professor of economics who was summoned to Washington by Franklin Roosevelt at a time, some years ago, when a financial crisis was pending. The President began the interview by remarking on the professor's great reputation and said that he had been given to understand that the professor knew more about money than any other economist in the country.

"You know the situation we are facing," the President is supposed to have continued. "I want you to tell me whether or not to raise the gold content of the dollar."

"I'm very sorry, Mr. President," the Professor replied. "I can't answer that question. I can tell you what will happen if you do raise the gold content of the dollar, and I can tell you what will happen if you don't. But whether or not you *ought* to raise it is not a scientific question."

Many social scientists, among whom this story has been current for some time, have protested against what seemed to them an excessively purist attitude on the part of the economist, claiming that if he could not answer the question neither could any one else. These critics have asserted in addition that since questions of a policy nature constantly arise, and since they must be answered, it is better to have them answered by someone who knows something about them than by someone who does not. They have suggested, finally, that scientists who behave in the manner of the economist are abdicating their responsibilities as citizens.

But that, say the scientific sociologists, is just the point. Science and citizenship are two different things. While a given individual may play two different rôles, that of scientist and that of citizen, it is of vital importance that he not try to play them both at once, and that the two rôles be not confused either by the scientist or by the general public. Science too has its obligations. If it is dangerous for the citizen to pretend he is a scientist, it is no less harmful for the scientist to pretend he is a citizen, to pretend he is giving a scientific answer to a nonscientific question. While neither science nor citizenship should fail to respect the responsibilities of the alternative rôles, these rôles and responsibilities should be distin-

guished. To adopt another course is to prostitute the prestige of science and of a scientific reputation.

Sociologists have been particularly careful to preserve this distinction. They know only too well that sociology has often been confused with social work, with social reform, with social prophecy, and even with socialism. The relationship of sociology to these other things, when it has one, is the same as that of physics to engineering, of physiology and anatomy to medicine, of trigonometry and astronomy to navigation, of jurisprudence to law, of political science to politics. Sociology is thus a pure science, not an applied science. Still less is it an art. While it shares its subject matter with very many other types of analysis, its method, in contrast to these other types, is scientific. Neither dialectic, nor faith, nor mysticism, nor authority, nor speculation, nor moral preferences, nor literary insight, nor yet indeed common sense can substitute for the scientific method in the study of society. All of the knowledge we have in this world is composed of temporarily true propositions and the only thing that distinguishes this knowledge from mere opinion is that it is derived and discovered by a consistent and systematic application of the scientific method. A factually solid and theoretically sound sociology can develop in no other than a scientific way.

III

The point may be made even more clear by recognizing that it is much more difficult for a scientist who studies the processes of society to maintain his ethical neutrality than it is for a scientist who studies the processes of nature. For the sociologist stands in a peculiar relationship to his material, a relationship from whose constraints the astronomer, the physicist, the chemist, and the biologist are all relatively free. Natural scientists are never a part of the problem they investigate. They begin their inquiries from a point of vantage which is wholly external to their data. The stars have no sentiments, the atoms no anxieties which have to be taken into account. Observation is objective with little effort on the part of the scientist to make it so. The binocular parallax may of course confound the observation of sidereal motions, the temperature of

the chemist's body may introduce an extraneous variable into a precise experiment, and individual differences may produce constant errors in a series of detailed measurements. But these errors are known, their effects can be measured, and their influences can be subtracted from the total score. In addition, the variables in these observations and experiments can be limited and controlled. In few cases does the scientist himself become a factor in the inquiry. It is only when he has to use language to communicate the results of his investigations that there is an opportunity for social and subjective factors to intrude, an opportunity which is reduced by the use of a mathematical symbolism.

The sociologist, on the other hand, stands in no such fortunate relationship to his material. He is from the beginning completely immersed in his data. He is always in some sense a part of the phenomenon he is investigating. He is always in the same sense a participant observer of the processes he studies, never an external one. For him that extra-dimensionality which is synonymous with objectivity is a goal to be achieved, not a condition given in his scientific situation. The glasses through which he peers at the social process, the categories in which he arranges his manifold and complex data, and the language in which he announces his results are all products of a particular culture at a particular time and place. He himself is a product of his culture, and conforms, consciously or unconsciously, to its folkways and mores, its institutions and laws, its customs and ideologies, its canons of evidence. This is one of the reasons why not even the past is stable and why, for example, history needs continuously to be rewritten. The sociologist has to strive, therefore, for an overt awareness of the biases and prejudices inherent in his own culture lest they interfere with his neutrality and color his conclusions. Without that constant diligence which alone can bring objectivity to his enterprise, the sociologist ceases to be a scientist and becomes only another variety of special pleader, susceptible to the patterns of his own cultural island and to the interests of the groups to which he happens to belong.

As a consequence of this requirement of the scientific method, the sociologist *qua* scientist has no ethical or cultural preferences. As a scientist he is neither for nor against "sin." He has no idea

whether democracy or dictatorship, or gerontocracy or gynaecocracy, is the best form of government. He does not choose between matrilineal and patrilineal kinship systems; for monogamy or polygamy he shows no public partiality. He may note, with Havelock Ellis and Edward Westermarck, respectively, that crime has its virtues, Christianity its defects. Although all of his evidence indicates that the inequality of human races is a myth, he would be the first to publish any evidence which would lend scientific support to the biases of a bigot. He does not characterize as evil so fundamental a social process as conflict and is not tempted to declare that the abolition of war is an ultimate social good. For his is the duty and the responsibility to study social phenomena objectively and without prejudice—without even those prejudices which are on the side of the angels.

Nor can it be expected, finally, that what the sociologist discovers in his researches will be of any immediate practical use. Without going so far as the famous mathematician who, when asked what he was doing, replied that whatever it was he hoped it would never be of any use to anybody, the sociologist, like his fellow scientists, knows that the ideas which move the world may come from quiet and untroubled syntheses of countless researches, that these ideas emerge, often without any spectacular quality, from the peace and calm of laboratory and study, that there is more often than not a considerable time lag between their discovery and their final impression upon society. The history of science testifies without stint to the fact that immediate utility has little to do with the ultimate worth of a scientific inquiry. As the late Morris R. Cohen was fond of pointing out, purely theoretical contributions to astronomy, physics, and mathematics, by increasing the precision of navigation, have saved more lives at sea than any possible improvements in the carpentry of lifeboats. So also the achievements of economists, historians, sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, and political scientists, slowly accumulating into some kind of a science of society, may in the future contribute more to world peace and to a social order purged of strains and tensions than any number of memberships on the policy committees of the present. The sociologist, like all scientists and scholars, must in some sense be a fugitive from urgency.

IV

But these are urgent and vexatious times. Admitting the cogency of these considerations, it remains true that we should all like to be fugitives from urgency and that for all of us it is later than we think. If the obligations of science are international, so also are the obligations of citizenship. And citizenship has claims upon all of the sciences. The atomic bomb has no respect for ivory towers. Is there not some way in which the rigorous requirements of the scientific method can be squared with the responsibilities of citizenship? Can the sociologist continue to dwell in a scientific stratosphere of his own in which no problems of public policy ever intrude?

An answer to these questions appears with the recognition that the virtues of ethical neutrality, of normative silence, and of objectivity, while wholly relevant to scientific inquiry itself, have nevertheless a reduced relevance to the total activity of the scientist. For there are four ways at least in which questions of value enter inevitably into the scientific situation. The first of these appears in the rôle of hypotheses. If the scientist cannot properly handle normative propositions, he can and does handle hypothetical ones. That is, *if* certain ends are desired, the scientist may, without compromising his scientific integrity, decide which of several alternative means can best be utilized for realizing these ends. Once the values of a society are determined and once the goals are set, the sociologist should be able, when he does not know the answers, to initiate researches which will supply them. He need have nothing to do with setting the goals themselves; he need, as a scientist, neither praise them as good nor condemn them as bad. It is required of him only to phrase his problem in such a way that he may determine, with the theoretical knowledge and experimental techniques at his command, what it is necessary to do in order to achieve the goal.

Thus, *if* a stable financial system is the desired social goal—the suppressed antecedent in the story above—the economist should be able to answer whether raising the gold content of the dollar at a particular time is a more effective means of achieving it than not raising it. And *if* a world at peace is one of the common sentiments and devout desires of all mankind, the sociologist should be able

so to direct his researches and reflections as to illumine the ways in which it can be won. Hypotheses and hypothetical propositions are no strangers to science; they are an essential part of the scientific method. They can be utilized as a bridge between science and social policy, between sociology and social action.

The second and third ways in which questions of value legitimately attach themselves to the scientific enterprise concern the kinds of problems to which to apply the scientific method and the order in which to try to solve them. Prior to the solution of any specific social problems it is a matter of nonscientific determination that some are susceptible to scientific exploration and that others are not. Similarly, of those that are susceptible to scientific exploration, it is a matter of nonscientific decision that some ought to be investigated first and others at a later and more propitious time. As a matter of fact, the choice of problems for scientific scrutiny is grounded in social and cultural conditions, and it is incumbent upon the sociologist, in some sense at least, to attend to the problems which his society sets for him. He has, in a deeper sense, no alternative. If he has no alternative it is in no way gratuitous to encourage him to concentrate his attention and his energy upon the earlier solution of the more pressing of these problems.

Finally, it is time for the scientist to acknowledge that the ultimate test of his activity lies in the social use and consequence of his conclusions. Whatever freedom the sociologist may achieve from the exigencies of time and circumstance, it is still important, and now more than ever before, to narrow the gap between the discovery of new principles and their application to the sphere of human relations. Society should not be the victim of a cultural lag between sociological knowledge and social use. No scientific scruples, therefore, as important as those scruples are, should delay a constantly increasing sensitivity to the social rôle of social science.

The conclusion seems inescapable that the sociologist can be a scientist and still accept some civic responsibility for the society in which he lives. If the world is full of tensions, he can indicate some of the ways in which they can be reduced. If the prospect of a new world war looms over the horizon, he ought to help to lay the specter. If the dissipation of national sovereignties and the establish-

ment of a world government are the only ultimate insurance against renewed conflicts between the nations, then he has the duty to show how such insurance can be purchased in the shortest possible time and at the lowest possible premium. The sociologist, in short, can help to build that one world whose only political boundaries are the outer atmosphere. In these days of the planet's malaise he can have no higher office and no more important function than this, to dedicate his science and his citizenship alike to a world community in which he, along with his fellow members of the human race, can live in peace.

THE MILITARY HISTORIAN OVERSEAS

By LYNN M. CASE

University of Pennsylvania

Not long after the United States entered World War II, the general public began to hear about the appointment of military historians as officers in the army. It sounded like something new; and, in the sense of instituting a specialized service in the army, it was a new departure. As with many innovations, there were bound to be some misconceptions as to the rôle of these historical officers. The nonhistorian civilian quite often had a somewhat romantic notion of the historical officer as a sort of news correspondent standing with the general on a nearby hill, with binoculars in one hand and a pencil in the other, busily recording for posterity an eyewitness account of the battle raging in the valley below. Likewise the professional historian in civilian life sometimes had a rather idealized conception of him as one of a group of uniformed scholars, with high priority facilities and all the top-secret records and files near at hand, devoting all his time to research projects and the joys of writing military history exactly as it had happened. The truth, however, lies somewhere in between with a great deal more added all along the line. Whether the historical officer resembled the news correspondent more than the cloistered scholar depended on how far down in the echelon of command he was and how near the front.

Overseas there were historical officers and enlisted men at almost every level of command. At the top was the historical section of the theater headquarters with the theater historian in command. He also had supervisory control of the historical teams which were attached to army groups, armies, and army corps. Below army corps it was customary for divisions, regiments, battalions, and companies to appoint one of their officers as a part-time historian. Also there were roving historians sent out from the theater or army headquarters to study and write up small-unit action accounts or

collect firsthand data on important engagements such as the Falaise Pocket or the Battle of the Bulge.

The duties of the overseas theater historian or of the commanding officer of one of the historical teams were much more than that of research and writing, however. He also had advisory, supervisory, and administrative functions.

In his advisory capacity the theater historian was a part of the staff of the American theater commander, who in some theaters was also the supreme Allied commander. It was his duty to advise the theater commander on the best means of complying with War Department directives concerning military history. He was also expected to initiate theater plans of his own and obtain for them the commanding general's approval. He had to attend various staff meetings and present and defend the historical services' interests whenever they were involved. The longer the theater historian remained at the same headquarters, the more valuable he was as an advisor to many of the other chief staff officers. In wartime there was such a rapid turnover of staff officers who were transferred to other theaters, to other commands, or to the War Department that the new replacements would often rely in part on the theater historian to furnish them information on past decisions or actions. In the practical every-day work of preparing staff studies, survey reports, or recapitulation of planning phases and campaigns the historical officer with his knowledge of the records was found to be of great assistance.

Actually the theater historian had little time for research and writing. When he was not advising, he was usually supervising the historical work in the entire theater. This included the varied historical projects being undertaken by the personnel in his own headquarters historical section, such as long and short accounts of each successive campaign, the history of the headquarters (administrative), of personnel, of supply, of medicine, of communications, etc., for the entire theater. Then he also had to draw up plans and directives for the preparation of similar histories by the lower commands, such as those of army groups, armies, army corps, divisions, services of supply, and even of smaller units. Since these lower echelons were naturally more interested in fighting and supplying than in history, the theater historians

often had the job of recruiting their personnel, organizing their teams, and closely supervising their work. This added function required the theater historian or one of his officers to be away from the headquarters almost a third of the time.

As the histories at the various levels were completed, they were usually sent to the theater historian for filing or transmitting. The theater section thus became an archival repository as well as a transshipping office. As time went on, the historical section became a very busy information center not only for the headquarters but for the whole theater and even for the War Department. Many histories were sent up in draft form for the theater historian or members of his staff to edit before the final versions were printed.

The theater historian not only had to slide down a vertical scale of historical activities, but he also had to travel across a horizontal plane by working in a liaison capacity with the historical organizations of the other American and Allied services. These theater organizations might include: an Allied historical section, a U. S. Air Force historical section, a U. S. Navy historical section, an Allied civil affairs historical section, a Royal Navy historical section, a British Army historical section, a Royal Air Force historical section, historical sections of the British dominions, and a French Army historical section. One of the distinctive characteristics of World War II was the joint participation of armies, air forces, and navies in all major operations. Hence the history of any of these operations was incomplete without the maximum data from each of the three. The Army theater historian therefore found it necessary to arrange for the exchange of historical data with these other historical groups. This in itself was a time-consuming job of visiting, conferences, and social fence-building.

History writing, like military operations, has to be planned ahead. Future history planning in the theater, however, required some knowledge of future operational plans. Where a theater commander was willing to share this top-secret information with the historical section, he usually limited it only to the most responsible historical officer, the theater historian. Thus, this one man, in addition to his other duties, had to read both the current planning papers and the highly classified cable dispatches and attend in person certain closely guarded conferences. In return for

these advantages he had the additional worry that none of this top-secret information should be divulged through the fault of the historical section.

By now it will be already apparent that the written eyewitness accounts of battles could very seldom be those of the theater historian or of his meager staff. However, a much better substitute was the eyewitness accounts of the multitude of participants in these battles and in the supply activities behind the lines. These accounts were usually found in the following types of documents: cable or radio messages (sometimes 20,000 a day in one theater headquarters), planning papers, directives and instructions, operational orders and instructions, movement orders, supply papers of every kind, unit and staff journals, unit and staff monthly histories, operational reports, administrative reports, situation reports, intelligence reports, and headquarters publications at each echelon of command (such as general orders, staff memos, etc.). This is just an abbreviated listing of the historical officers' "eyes and ears" which were generally denominated the theater records. The custody of these records, as they passed out of current usefulness, was the responsibility of the theater adjutant general, but the theater historian also had a responsibility to see that the records of future historical value were preserved and properly stored. In case some of them were currently needed for historical writing in the theater, he endeavored to have the adjutant general arrange proper archive facilities, including systematic cataloguing, to make them readily accessible.

With the capitulation of the enemy forces in the various theaters, the unforeseen responsibility of preserving the enemy's military records fell, in part, to the lot of the theater historian. No history of a campaign is complete if based exclusively on the records of only one side in the conflict. By the unconditional surrender in World War II the Allies had the rare advantage of possessing the records of both sides, just as did the United States after the Civil War. But, as in the case of the Confederate records of the Civil War, the German and Japanese records were likely to be destroyed, hidden, stolen, or ignored unless special efforts were made to round them up and preserve them. While the various intelligence services shared in the use of and interest in the enemy's records, the

theater historian was especially concerned with the collection and preservation of this enemy material for future historical use.

In addition to advising and supervising, the theater historian had a heavy administrative responsibility. First he had to obtain approval of tables of organization allowing sufficient personnel for historical work. To accomplish this he had to clear the hurdles of manpower-conscious personnel authorities. As historical activities increased, these tables had to be successively revised upwards with all the attendant troubles of convincing the higher authorities all over again. The next administrative task was to find the right kind of personnel to fill these allotted vacancies, and after that came their instruction, rations, quarters, clothing, medical care, travel, leaves, promotions, awards, and discipline.

Besides personnel there was the problem of property administration. Office accommodations had to be provided, office furniture and supplies obtained, vehicles procured and maintained, and printing, drafting, and photographic facilities arranged. The administrative requirements added up to full-time jobs for an administrative officer, a supply sergeant, a file clerk, and a typist.

All of these functions of the theater historian were duplicated to a lesser degree for the commanding officers of the subordinate historical teams.

II

Up to this point it has been a question of the normal functions of historical officers overseas. But they give no idea of the innumerable unforeseen problems that the theater historian and his historical officers had to face and solve by whatever fund of intelligence and resourcefulness they could command. Their staff manuals, if any, did not forewarn concerning these problems, nor did their directives and instructions provide for them. Here each type of problem will be discussed separately.

Unsympathetic Commanding Officers. The historical officer at almost every level of command was likely to be given initially a rather cool and questioning reception. The staff manuals providing for staff organization at the beginning of World War II had not included a historical officer or staff section. Consequently the

arrival of any officer who did not fit into the standard organization was greeted with suspicion, especially if he was not to carry out some combat duties. The overseas commander was always plagued with what he considered to be an insufficient allotment of troops. With what he had, he tried to obtain the highest percentage of combat personnel. Therefore the introduction of a new non-combat activity in his command was likely to be regarded at first as some War Department boondoggling.

To be sure, the commanding officer overseas in time of war was conscious of making history; he hoped his campaigns might be so outstanding as to receive prominence in later historical accounts. But, as the average commander looked over his staff, he might feel that he already had plenty of history recorders. Here was his G-3 or S-3 who provided him with the draft after-action campaign reports and his public relations officer who prepared the daily news reports for the benefit of the reading public and posterity. Later on, when he retired, the commanding officer himself probably intended to write a book or compose his own memoirs. Now just why did he have to be loaded down with a historical officer and his section? He might not be discourteous enough actually to put this question to the newly arrived officer, but frequently such thoughts went through his mind or revealed themselves in conversations with others. This attitude was also often reflected in the lack of cooperation which the historical officer received when he began to ask for certain facilities and access to certain records and meetings. The new historical officer was almost invariably on the defensive and had to do a thorough job of "selling" his services and proving his usefulness over a long period of time.

Now that the Army historical service has demonstrated its value to overseas commands and the War Department has established the Historical Division on its special staff, it is likely that the historical section will be recognized as a part of the standard organization of all military areas and overseas commands. Thus we may have some assurance that this problem will not be as prevalent in the future.

The Nonhistorical Attitude. But the problem of the lack of understanding on the part of army commanders and staff officers concerning the historical profession, its methods, aims, and re-

quirements, will always be encountered by the historical officer.

This lack of comprehension is not limited to the military profession; it is encountered by the historian everywhere in his contacts with the public and the nonhistorical professions. It became more acute in the army, however, because the historical officer in the military hierarchy was usually subordinate to men of the military rather than of the historical profession. The nonhistorian commanders quite often considered historians to be just writers and thought that any one who had a facility for writing could do a good historical job. Or they were likely to think of history as apologetics with its main purpose to justify the deeds of commanders. They were impatient of slow and thorough research and often wondered why a historian could not sit down, like a stenographer, take oral dictation on a particular subject, and return the next morning with a well-written historical account in final form. War correspondents sent out their dispatches in a shorter time than that. Why not historians? For a historian to search out the records in order to verify or amplify the details given orally by a commanding officer was sometimes considered a reflection on the latter's honesty. A subordinate officer was supposed to have confidence in and respect for his superior. Therein lay one of the most serious obstacles in the way of a sound Army historical service.

In one overseas theater a secretary of the general staff ordered an overseas historical section to write in three weeks an official history of an entire campaign for submission to the Combined Chiefs of Staff. The vastness of the project and the fact that it was to become the Allied commander's report to the CCS nearly overwhelmed the section with the responsibility involved. They had no time to take notes from the records. Instead they piled a hundred or more files containing about five thousand documents on their desks and wrote night and day directly from the records. One morning the secretary of the general staff inspected the section and in the afternoon sent it a memorandum instructing the historical officers to adopt the proper Army office procedure of having only *one* paper at a time on their desks!

While many other similar examples might be cited, it is only fair to add that many officers of the military profession were quite receptive to the historian's point of view and, once fully informed

concerning standards and needs, were very cooperative and sympathetic.

Unofficial Histories. The work of the Army historical service was not the only historical activity among the lower echelons in the theater. One of the problems frequently arising was to have a distinction made between official and unofficial histories, or even sometimes to disassociate the official historical service from unprofessional private enterprises.

During a war the esprit de corps of divisions, regiments, battalions, and companies usually developed into a permanent group loyalty akin to the old-school-tie feeling among university alumni. A common corollary to this attitude was the desire to have a unit's exploits written up in some sort of "souvenir" history. Before such a unit was dissolved, subscriptions were collected and plans were made for a small group of officers and men to write and publish a volume. Prior to the establishment of the historical service, this had been about the only way that unit histories had ever been written. Even in World War II some of these "souvenir" histories, compiled under the auspices of trained historians, proved to be excellent contributions to military history.

However, in the majority of cases these private subscriptions turned out very low-grade histories from the point of view of professional historical standards. The writers were often not trained historians who knew how to carry on thorough research. They were usually too anxious to get the job done quickly to have sufficient patience to wade through the voluminous records of their outfit. Indeed they were often relieved to find so many records transferred or missing. They could then rely on their own recollections and on those of men near at hand for interviews. Often these men were not even good writers, their material was poorly organized, and the main emphasis was turned to photographs of groups of the "boys," of chateaux used as headquarters, and of prized items of equipment. The whole tone of most subscription histories was laudatory, even boastful. "The customer is always right." And in this case the customers were the subscribers. The last commanding officer of the unit usually acted as a fatherly sponsor of the history, and his feelings and attitudes were given due consideration by the writing staff.

It caused some embarrassment to the theater historian, therefore, when people in and out of the Army began to consider these "souvenir" histories from his theater as products of his own historical section. Also he was compelled to do a lot of explaining when his superior officers showed enthusiasm for these amateur efforts and began to ask why the historical section was so slow in completing their own studies.

In one theater in World War II the information and education section began to publish a series of division histories. These were definitely pamphlet souvenir jobs written by nonhistorians, usually by journalists, by men of other professions, or by men with no professional background. Here was an activity under the authority of the same theater commander for whom the historical section was also working. Under such circumstances the theater historian was able to have the pamphlets redesignated as division "stories."

Some of the "souvenir" projects were never undertaken after the funds had been subscribed. These funds constituted a perplexing problem to the chief finance officer and the theater inspector general who frequently turned to the theater historian for a solution when such projects were actually not a part of his program.

Research Problems. Historical research is difficult and time-consuming even under the best of circumstances, but in an overseas theater the discouragements and hindrances encountered in research were greatly increased.

In the first place the security precautions were frequently so extreme that officers in charge of records refused historians access to them. Officers higher up were reluctant to make an exception for historians lest it become a precedent for opening up highly classified material to many other groups in the theater. In the second place some records, particularly in joint Allied units, contained embarrassing information on internal squabbles; other records contained data unfavorable to the commanding officer. In both instances there was a tendency to "sit on" the material until a peremptory order was received from higher up. Consequently the usual experience of a theater historian was that he had to go as high as the theater chief of staff and have him furnish a basic authorization

for access to official records in order to overcome such obstacles in the way of research.

Once the researcher obtained access to the voluminous records, he often found a most disordered system of filing. File clerks were usually very inadequately trained. In many instances the enlisted men in charge of filing were not file clerks at all. Where intelligent and trained file clerks did begin a job with a set of records, they were usually in such demand that they were soon transferred and succeeded by untrained men. Hence a historical officer, after he had examined a file on a certain subject, could not be sure he had seen all the papers on that subject. Sooner or later he was certain to find other important papers on the same subject in absolutely unrelated files. This common situation finally required a search in many unrelated files to make sure that all pertinent materials had been located.

But written records were not the only sources of historical data. The research historian also liked to interview the participants in operations or administration. Here again he encountered many difficulties. War had its high percentage of casualties. By the time the historian was ready to gather first-hand material for a certain project, he found some of the key men had either been killed, wounded and evacuated, captured, or transferred to another theater. Moreover, personal recollections, which are often inaccurate or blurred in the hurly-burly of warfare, frequently misinformed the historian or gave him a false start on an incident which later proved to be apocryphal.

Lack of Reference Materials. In addition to its regular program of writing official military histories and preserving historical records, the theater historical section soon discovered that it was relied upon to furnish a wide range of historical information to all military offices and commands in the theater. The agencies of the military government of occupied territories wanted data on local administrative, economic, and institutional history as a basis for their plans for local government. The educational and recreational agencies for American troops sought information to use in tourist and travel guides. Naturally they looked upon the theater historians as experts who could give immediate answers to all queries. The phone was constantly ringing with questions about

the history of the ruins of the medieval castle on yonder hill, the tactics of a combat two thousand years ago on a nearby battlefield, or the tribe which inhabited a local area in 163 B.C. Failure to give immediate off-the-cuff answers to such inquiries branded the historical personnel as incompetents. This might put the theater historian at a disadvantage when he asked for more personnel and privileges.

Yet the Army's system of assignments often failed to place the right men in the logical areas. The specialist on medieval Mediterranean history was likely to be perspiring on a Pacific island; a Far Eastern authority might turn up at Frankfurt-am-Main; while the specialist on the Populist movement in Iowa might find himself reporting for duty at the foot of Mt. Vesuvius by the ancient ruins of Pompeii.

These men obviously did not know all the answers, but as trained historians they were familiar with the voluminous reference works where most answers could be found. The catch here was that most overseas historical sections were not supplied with reference materials. Historical sections could have been of considerable assistance to the overseas forces if they had been furnished from the start as a part of their tables of equipment at least the standard works on the history of their areas and the best sets of encyclopedias.

Historian as Handy Man. While the historical officer was trying to oblige with encyclopedic information, he might be called on to perform in person many other duties of a similar nature. The overseas theaters were always a focus for the visiting important persons (VIP's). Kings, presidents, prime ministers, special advisors, cabinet members, congressmen and congressional committees, generals, admirals, or their wives, sons, brothers, and cousins made up a steady stream of visitors, advisors, and investigators. They invariably wanted to see the sights—the fields, and mountains, and valleys recently made famous by gallantly won battles. They wanted to be led to the top of the hill from whence they could see all the important points of the battlefield and hear on the spot an explanation of the tactics. The divisions which fought there had long since gone on to other battles. It remained for the historical officers of the theater to be the tourist guides. If

the area was rich in relics of past ages, again the historian was selected to do the honors as a guide. Two or three times a month some historical officer would have to leave his ever-accumulating work and fare forth to the fields.

The congressional committees were the most exacting, for some were always thinking in terms of a junket while others were concerned with probing and criticizing. Both sets had to be satisfied. When the historian returned from the field, he or his historical comrades were beseeched to aid the other staff sections in preparing voluminous reports and endless statistics for the inquisitorial committees.

As historical sections expanded, they came to include expert draftsmen, artists, and sometimes photographers. When their histories were completed and circulated for concurrence, the other branches of the headquarters became conscious of a place where they could go to have charts and maps drafted or have a sketch or painting made of certain subjects. These requests had nothing to do with history, but it was not good policy to refuse the extra services. Favor for favor was as common a practice in the army as in politics.

Then came the regulations on the Bronze Arrowhead which specified participation in an amphibious landing before the beachhead was firmly secured. Well, what units had been there? Exactly when had the beachhead been secured? The theater historian was supposed to determine the facts for each beachhead and even for each individual application for an award.

Guide, lecturer, teacher, statistician, draftsman, cartographer, artist, and judge—all these and historian too—were the rôles of the staff's handy man.

Destruction of Records. To seventy-five per cent of the overseas forces records were valuable only for current use. Once they were out of date, they became just so much impedimenta to burden the onward march of victorious armies. Perhaps there was a scarcity of trucks for moving a certain headquarters, or a new headquarters establishment was cramped for space.

"Colonel, what shall we do with these files we haven't used for months?"

"Throw them out! Have yourself a bonfire!"

The adjutant general and the theater historian had to carry on a running battle with the combat units to get them to screen records before destruction and save those of administrative and historical value. The combat commanders, always understaffed, were inclined to be impatient with red-tape directives sent from the swivel-chair officers at headquarters. They did not know how to screen and did not want to bother. "If you want them screened, have some one come down to do it" was a typical reply. Too often the local historical officer, realizing the future value of these papers, would take time to supervise or advise on the screening of a large quantity of documents. More often he heard with despair of the destruction or "loss" of large sets of material after it was too late to preserve them.

Dispersal of Records. Then, again, even if the records were saved, they were often not available. In writing up a history of any important engagement, it might be necessary to consult the divisional records and reports. But the division with all its records had long since been reshipped to another theater. Or the division was still in the theater, but it had sent half of its records (the noncurrent ones) back to the Adjutant General of the War Department. The theater historian had the choice of writing without the needed data or tracing the records to a records depot (not yet catalogued) back in the States. Even in the latter case he usually did not get his data.

Lack of Qualified Personnel. The job of obtaining and administering personnel was difficult enough in itself but was also made doubly so by the scarcity of professionally trained historians in the army. Most professors of history in time of war were needed by their schools or universities to teach the special Army and Navy groups assigned to those institutions for pre-service training. Those historians who did succeed in entering the service were frequently assigned—because of their historical background, teaching ability, or linguistic training—to what were considered more urgent duties, such as intelligence, liaison, civilian administration of occupied territories, or to Army and Navy training schools. The very fact that official military history had obtained the earlier reputation of being controlled history discouraged some historians from accepting such an assignment. The historical service therefore

found available only a small percentage of its own professional men.

The scarcity of trained historians meant that a large number of the historical officers had to come from nonhistorical professions or from groups of nonprofessional men. Too often the layman has the idea that any one can write history. As a result the overseas historical sections were in danger of becoming the catch-all of the misfits and incompetents whom no one else wanted and whom the army hesitated to reclassify. When the theater historian refused to take them, the personnel authorities began to get the impression that his personnel needs were not very urgent after all.

Often the theater historian's superior officers were quite enthusiastic about recommending journalists for historical duty. A journalist did impress higher-ranking staff officers with his ability to write and to get headline "dope" on current campaigns. A few journalists might actually have turned out to be good historians, but in general their approach and training was quite the opposite from that of the historian. They did not have the patience for minute and prolonged research. They were interested in "hot scoops" and emphasized the sensational. Their training stressed the present rather than the past, and they were prone to arrive at quick conclusions often phrased in unqualified superlatives or in "journalese." As a result the theater historian had to turn a deaf ear to these suggestions.

Lawyers, sometimes, helped as substitutes for professional historians. But again they were usually unacquainted with historical methods and were inclined to gather facts to prove a case rather than to let the cases prove themselves. Then, too, their speaking ability often excelled their writing qualifications.

The best solution to the problem of untrained officer personnel was to select capable graduates of liberal arts colleges who had had a broad cultural education and then give them concentrated instruction in methods of historical research and writing. They adjusted themselves quickly to the new task and usually had already had a good general experience in writing. One overseas historical section functioned successfully with the following heterogeneous line-up of liberal-arts graduates: three trained historians, four young graduates without professional training, one lawyer, one

forester, one accountant, one classical linguist, one business manager, and one artist.

However, as serious as the problem of the lack of trained personnel was that of just the plain lack of personnel. After a year or so the theater historian might be able to get authorization for sufficient personnel to meet his minimum requirements. Almost immediately, though, he was faced with a manpower drive to obtain more able-bodied men for combat duty. If some of his officers and men were physically qualified for front-line action, it was almost impossible for a theater historian to plead the needs of history over the needs of combat. By the time combat was concluded, redeployment set in. It mattered not how vital a man was to the successful conclusion of a project on which he was the sole expert. If he had the required number of points, he left for home. The theater historian thus had to start over again with untrained replacements or close up shop.

In spite of the multitudinous duties and the perplexing problems of the historical officers overseas, it must be acknowledged that they witnessed during their terms of service an ever-growing interest in, and understanding of, the best standards of historical scholarship by the military profession, from the War Department down to the field commanders. To the Army's General Staff history is no longer a matter of antiquarianism or retrospective self-glorification. It has become one of the important technical adjuncts to intelligent military planning and operations. The fact that the historical service will be continued, that a separate Historical Division has been set up in the War Department's Special Staff, and that more adequate facilities have been made for repositories of Allied, American, and captured enemy records is all clear evidence of the proved value of the Army's historical service in the last war and of the Army's acceptance of the historical profession as an essential element of national defense.

LITERATURE AND THE CONSENT OF THE SOPHOMORE

By ROBERT H. WEST

University of Georgia

In most American colleges the largest department is the English department. In many it is the only department to whose instruction every student must submit at one time or another. Perhaps it teaches cultural subjects to more students than all other departments put together. With its advantages it ought to be the backbone of liberal education in America. But some of us who teach in English departments have long felt that they don't do quite a backbone's job for liberal education, and hundreds of our colleagues in other departments say plainly that English couldn't be a backbone to anything.

The benefits which the catalogue usually proclaims that we confer are two: the power to write acceptably and the power to read literature with understanding. Our efforts to teach decent writing all our colleagues encourage, for they admit its desirability. But on the literature and our undertaking with it many scientists and vocationalists look extremely sour. It is wholly impractical, isn't it? Sir Isaac Newton said poetry was just "ingenious fiddle-faddle," didn't he? and what does the English department ever show that could make anyone suppose him wrong? What good is literature anyway, either to the man or to the country?

Our answer, haughtily ignoring Sir Isaac, often goes about as follows: Whereas science understands the world by quantity, literature, together with the other arts, understands it by its qualities. Since half the life of the mind is in the grasp of qualities, no man may rightly neglect it, and he who does neglect or suppress the studies that cultivate it invites the grossest materialism. Literature is especially important to society in our time because, among other things, it helps counteract society's dangerous tendency to

split into unsympathetic cells along the divisions of labor and knowledge. Men are now so separated by their specialties that they find it hard to understand one another when they talk of humane ends; in superficial experience even persons of the same tongue, nation, and class may have little in common except the movies and the radio. But literature cuts through all surface smear to make plain the universality of many immediate, particular experiences, great and small, which we all share but often do not understand or even recognize in their essential humanness. In literature such experiences as separation, disappointment, renewal, and the rest of man's life as all men live it, take form—that is, become knowledge—in a way wholly foreign to scientific knowledge but equal to it. It is fair to say that persons who understand literature may also understand each other (though not necessarily agree with each other) about some important matters dark to science. And this, in part at least, is what literature is good for.

Well, but, object our critics, granting this magic to literature, do English departments really invoke it? Not to judge by what an outsider can tell of their students. The many who stop literature as soon as they are allowed to do so seldom or never admit to having “got anything out of it.” The few who return voluntarily to it are either girls or sickly males who rarely amount to much—unless it's more English teachers. So really, then, your compulsory English course alienates most of those who take it and your elective English course is either a distraction for females awaiting marriage or a hole for refugees from hard reality. Literature may be fine, but your use of it can't be much or we would see more impressive results.

This is, of course, a very rough and sweeping indictment and, so far as it is simply a slur on co-eds and on literary-minded males, no English teacher can possibly subscribe to it without the rankest treason. Certainly we can't believe it a reproach that some of our majors turn English teachers; ours is an honorable enough calling and as “real” as others.

But the true indictment is not that we suit the students whom we do suit, but that we so conspicuously estrange others less special and perhaps more vigorous, particularly those males with a turn for business and politics, who go firmly on from college to run

the world deeper into that materialism we deplore. Many of these boys are thoughtful and even sensitive, as well as energetically executive; literature ought to grip them. But it seldom does.

Their attitude toward English appeared most clearly to me during the war, when I was in close touch with the flyers of a bombardment squadron—intelligent, extroverted boys of college age. Whenever they asked me what I used to teach, if I answered “English” or “literature” most of them showed plainly that they thought it piddling. They were often mildly derisory, or they paid me the compliment of saying they thought I must be glad to be out of it. Not that they lacked respect for higher education; if I answered “Philology” or “Semantics”—or for that matter “Synecdoche”—they were mystified but respectful, and if I claimed that I taught people how to write things and *sell* them, they were extremely respectful.

Scientific and commercial studies had standing with these boys; literature had none. But literature ought to have standing with them; it did have with Vikings and troubadours and Elizabethan explorers and the flyers of the RAF and a good many other manly men. The fault is not in literature; poetry is *not* fiddle-faddle. Something, then, is wrong with the boys or with the teaching or with both.

II

In the boys, certainly, is a creeping philistinism. Less and less, to take a simple factual example, can the English instructor count on his sophomores having the general background in folk tales, mythology, and the Bible that twenty years ago was fairly common, and the lack of which makes heavy going in, say, a compulsory sophomore survey of world literature. To a student who has never heard before of Zeus, Hector, or Aphrodite, much less of Thetis, Andromache, or Diomedes, the *Iliad* may seem an alien kind of talk. And it is positively hostile if to deficiencies in factual knowledge the student adds a constant wooden failure in discernment and a callous unconcern for it.

Is there grandeur in an epic simile? The sophomore just wonders if the thing is likely to be on Friday's test. Is there pathos in

the parting of Hector from his wife and son? But the sophomore is busy with what he thinks a thoroughly bootless complication: the two names for the pesky kid. Is there the keenest appropriateness in the description of a speared soldier as with "knees unstrung"? The sophomore finds it affected and unnatural; he thinks the whole thing less dramatic than the funny papers. And this poor taste and dull perception, this simple inability to read, does not isolate him among his mates. On the contrary, he is the norm, one in a majority. No wonder he is callous to his shortcomings.

Being human, this sophomore is, of course, quite capable of sensing grandeur or pathos or appropriate wording, just as he is capable of other qualities. When he chants "Yea Siwash! Yea Bulldogs! Yea yea Siwash Bulldogs!" he knows a low-grade appropriateness in the relation of words. When he dances or plays basketball with style he has intense feeling for quality. But from quality in its refined and contemplative forms he has always been fenced off by his home, his school, and his amusements, by virtually every experience of his daily life.

All our compulsory courses in literature are peopled by boys like this. The ambitious ones, with memories buzzing, chase grades like pups after a chicken. The unambitious sit inert and hope the instructor will find it not expedient to fail them all. At the end of the year, most, ambitious or not, escape thankfully into the money-making branches, and as they go they often say aloud, "I never want to hear of Shakespeare and Silas Marner and all that again as long as I live."

While the students flee gratefully to Cost Accounting, News Photography, and Family Relations (or the more serious ones, perhaps, to science laboratories) the worn English instructor escapes if he can in another direction, off to his advanced courses and his special students. Far more English teachers have found satisfaction, reputation, and top salaries in the graduate school than in the junior college; consequently most English teachers value the graduate school first, put up with the junior college as they must.

If the capable instructor cannot wholly escape sophomores, then often he simply teaches his sophomores as nearly as he can manage in the style he uses for graduates. The concessions he makes to differences in capacity and selectness are simple reductions: he

skips textual criticism and the lesser works, assigns thirty pages instead of a special project. But he does not change his basic purpose to present the materials and techniques of a semi-professional study. When exposing a piece of literature to his class, he may now and then fretfully elucidate a little of the text, but he prefers to take the general comprehension of it as given, and to work away at critical analysis and scholarly commentary. His tests separate those who can and will follow him from the rest. In sum, he makes his sophomore class a sort of remote proving ground for the graduate school. Where his purpose should be to do what he can with literature as a general instrument and constituent of liberal education, he seems instead to do what he can with literature as a departmental and highly selective specialty in competition with other such specialties. It is as though (somewhat illiberally, may one think?) he held it good to impose the discipline of the literary scholar on all the world. With such an end he is little help to his sophomores, however keen his insight into literature or wide his learning.

In this devotion to the graduate school the superior instructor is not alone; his pedestrian colleague has probably no less yearning for it. But his ideal of the graduate school is a fact-collecting machine, and his use of it is for a kind of haughty vocational training. His instruction of sophomores is a tacit acknowledgment of this vocationalism, a narrow drill in the facts and classifications of literature. And so a subject rich, free, and humane comes to be taught often in the manner of an exacting carpenter coaching an apprentice. No wonder the lustier and more uncontentplative students soon scorn it as at once difficult, uninteresting, impractical, and unmanly, while those special students who are determined to take it anyway brace themselves for studies that may become as technical as bookkeeping and as remote as paleontology from the comprehension and values of everyday man.

In short, far from spreading the healing effects of literature through society generally, we are merely adding another to the fatal discontinuities of our day, to the deadly failures of sympathy between men of differing classes, places, occupations, or schooling. On the one hand we affront and abandon a great majority of students; on the other we draw a select body into our special mys-

teries. Thus we encourage a cleavage, a diminution of understanding, between two vastly unequal groups, with virtually all our successes, all the positive results of exposure to literature, concentrated in the group that is small, semi-professional, and relatively unimportant.

III

It would not become me to disparage our mysteries and I have no wish to do so. I do not suggest any retreat from the full and mature teaching of literary criticism or of linguistics or the history of literature or any related subject. We will not do better work by giving up the good work we have already to our credit.

But this good work in special studies and with special students can neither justify our prominence in the college nor preserve it. For literature in the college is not justified and sustained in the way that nuclear physics is, which with only a minuscule body of initiates can do its true service and keep an immense importance in the eyes of everybody. Literature cannot thus center in graduate courses for which all undergraduate courses are conceived to be mere selective feeders. Literature has its general importance not by virtue of something that it does to people in mass and from outside at the manipulation of a master, but by virtue of something that it does to them inside by their consent and application. Under the English departments, literature is not arousing consent and application in enough people for us to claim much general importance.

Well, then, is the ordinary sophomore too slight and vulgar a person to stand any kind of discipline in literature? If so, we should fold up all our efforts to spread culture generally; we should be put out to graze with Latin and Greek. But if not, then we must find the discipline that he can stand and that will claim his consent and application.

The minimum that can be worth anyone's while to insist on is that the student shall grasp some decent literature in its essence, shall achieve some knowledge in the way special to literature. This is to say that at least he shall experience a few times what may be called the simple or primary literary effect. I recognize, of course,

that the full effect of any piece of literature needs a deliberate technical appreciation. But a perfectly respectable effect, too, comes from the plain understanding of what the author says and without conscious detection of the devices he uses to say it well, or any particular analysis of the effect itself. When the sophomore knows clearly what an author says, then if he is humanly sensitive (and of course he is), he experiences this simple effect. The subject of my book, says Wilfrid Owen, is "war and the pity of war. The poetry is in the pity." When the sophomore can understand the pity of war out of Owen's book, he has the poetry. Give him his year's worth of such understanding from various books, and everybody's time and money are well spent though he never go a step beyond it.

But can he go even this far? Certainly he can with judiciously chosen literature; for as I have already said, the normal college boy is quite capable of a simple hospitality to the qualities of things. He has, in addition, a normal capacity for reflection and a normal interest in some, at least, of the matters literature treats. Almost any student will listen if you just tell him a story; most students will meditate what they like to call the "moral" or "message" or "lesson" of the "story"; and very many students are affected by themes of death and of the general sad impermanence of desirable things. With these tastes and talents to work on we ought, surely, to be able to make them accept Homer and Housman and no telling what besides—always supposing that we do not smother the simple effect.

If we swaddle the story of the *Iliad* with critical and historical instruction instead of merely bridling its power for the sophomore with some sort of decent simplification—in part, say, by judicious citing of contemporary parallels he can understand—he will never take it. And if he does not, we gain nothing by making him parrot the characteristics of the folk epic or the migrations of the Achaeans; it is just memory work; he has had no experience of literature. But give him a chance and he can see that Hector's parting with Andromache is dramatic, not merely troublesome, that the novel image about a warrior's unstrung knees is a sharp picture of collapse into the dust, and that the rest of the tale is in keeping. Then he will take the *Iliad*.

And in taking it he cannot miss some feeling of the appropriateness of the language to the story. He is bound to see, for instance, that according to Homer the world is rough but not ignoble, men harried by external powers but not wholly determined, sorrow endless but not mean.

In fact, the sophomore is willing enough to hear of these things overtly, once the story is plain to him. By "moral" or "message" he would like to mean an illustration of principles for the great questions and answers, and indeed he thinks he does mean this. Since, however, he has normally a reading ability about fitted to a *True Confessions* story, it is no wonder if what he really signifies by "moral" is simply a catch-phrase which he values because it gives him a feeling of accomplishment that he desperately needs. But once he has the sense of a piece of literature as a reasonable whole, he is capable usually of grasping some, at least, of its meaning. Of *Macbeth*, say, he can at least realize that its meaning is a good deal grander and more complex than *Never take a woman's advice* or *Don't betray a trust*, that in fact one ought not to speak in his sense of a "moral" in *Macbeth*. And eventually he may find *Macbeth* clear as a True Confession never is, however easy.

The sophomore is rarely patient, I grant, of many profundities at a time. But read him sonorous talk about Death and Sacrifice and the Transience of Strength and Beauty—*Thanatopsis*, that is, or *A Tale of Two Cities*, or Villon—then he will listen as the young always have. Is such literature beneath us? I think not.

But hundreds of English teachers know these ways and many better ones to grip the sophomore. They need no coaching from me. What we all do need is the will and the decision to do the job. Perhaps doing it entails giving up for the sophomore all the aims special to the Great Authors course and the period course and the historical survey and the things-everybody-ought-to-know scheme, in general. Is that surrender unthinkable? Let us teach whatever decent literature can most surely win the sophomore's consent and application; let us blandly skip *Lycidas* and the essays of Emerson, fine and widely revered though they be.

Almost certainly, to redeem ourselves in the junior college, we must be freed from the direct pull the graduate school exerts by having superior prestige and salaries and privileges. Should not a

man win as much honor, pay, and indulgence by a superlative accomplishment among the swarming generations of sophomores as by one among the difficult archives of the medieval drama? But no English instructor will be thus recompensed while his department goes on pretending that "research" in literature has the same relation to the elementary courses that it does in biochemistry.

Perhaps it is not too late for English departments to teach some literature to the general student body. And perhaps now they must teach it to the general student body if literature is long to have its big part in public education or the public any noticeable part in formal literature.

THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT AS HE IS TODAY

By B. W. KUNKEL

Lafayette College

In the past quarter of a century college administration has become increasingly complex as the college has undertaken to enlarge its services to the students and to the community. As a result of this development, administrative staffs of colleges have increased proportionately more than the instructional staffs and administration has become a specialized vocation. There was a time when the college president might meet most, if not all, of the students regularly in the classroom; but it is an unusual president today who would undertake a regular schedule of teaching. Increased administrative demands have not only resulted in the appointment of more administrative officers, but also of many part-time administrators who tend in time to slough off their teaching duties and give all of their time to administration. Thus college administration constantly makes inroads upon the ranks of teachers. With the increase in their numbers administrators have been increasingly differentiated from teachers as regards both salary and prestige.

In view of the many and varied demands upon them, and the prestige of their positions, it has seemed interesting to examine the backgrounds of college presidents to determine the roads which led to their positions, and to discover whether the qualifications of those who hold these positions today have undergone any kind of change, parallel with the changed requirements of these positions. Specifically, it is interesting to know whether college presidents today are chosen from the ranks of those whose profession is teaching and research to a greater or to a lesser extent than in earlier years; from what kinds of positions they are recruited; from what kinds of communities they received their early impressions of life, and to what extent their formal education has been carried.

As a means of obtaining a clearer picture of the American college president at the present time, the list of colleges published in the

World Almanac for 1946—a list based upon the educational directory of the United States Office of Education of 1944-45—was consulted. This list includes 812 institutions of collegiate rank, with the names of their chief administrative officers. The biographical data of the presidents of these institutions were gathered from the then current volume of *Who's Who in America*. Three hundred and seven of the 812 were not listed in the latter work, but of this number 76 were obviously by their titles members of Holy Orders of the Roman Catholic Church, whose way of life, more or less sequestered in convent and monastery, would not lead to inclusion in such biographical dictionaries. These specific data abstracted from *Who's Who in America* include the birthplace, birth year, Alma Mater, degrees in course, educational positions held, and other preparation for the present position. In a few cases the biographical data were scanty; in others the lacunae could be filled with reasonable certainty. For example, when the biographical sketch indicated graduation from a school of theology, but did not record the subject's occupation prior to his appointment to his present position in a theological school, it was assumed that he held a pastorate before he became a college president.

II

The age of college presidents now in office shows a rather wide range, from 37 to 82 years, with an average of 55.59 years. Excluding one-third of the most extreme ages, the average of the middle two-thirds is 55.24 years. Whether this age justifies the characterization of the president as *old*, depends, of course, largely upon the age of the evaluator.

The age at which the presidency was reached by 499, from whose biography it was ascertainable, was from 22 to 72, with an average of 44.81 years. Whether there has been any change over the years in the average age at appointment to a college presidency is not possible to determine from the available data. For the college president frequently wears out either himself or his welcome during a relatively short period of service, so that of those who have served the longest among those now occupying office, only the ablest and sturdiest have survived from among those who at the time of their

appointment were among the youngest. The one president appointed in 1895—the longest in service in the record—was 30 years old when appointed. The next oldest in point of service was 29 years old, the next 39, 44, and 37 in their order. Ten who have served for 20 years had an average of 43.05 at the time of appointment; 9 who have served for 19 years had an average of nearly 42 years; 7 who have served 18 years averaged 45.5; and 7 who have served 17 years averaged 44 years. Twenty-four who have been in the presidential chair for 10 years averaged 43.5 years at appointment; 25 who have served 9 years averaged 43.16 years; and those who have served for 8 years averaged 44 years of age at appointment. Twenty-six who were appointed in 1944 averaged nearly 52 years of age and those appointed in 1945 a little over 55 years—the youngest being 40 and the oldest 67. In the previous year the youngest was 35 and the oldest was 63.

Of the 503 whose birthplaces were determined, all but 23 were born within the confines of the United States. Nine were Canadian by birth; one was born in Egypt and one in Japan. The rest were born in Europe; Ireland, England, Germany, and the Netherlands each produced two. By states, Pennsylvania has produced the largest number, 39; followed by Ohio with 35 and New York with 33. Illinois produced 22. Virginia, Georgia, Indiana, and Iowa each produced 21; and Massachusetts, North Carolina, and Tennessee 17 each; Michigan and South Carolina each 14; Missouri 13, Alabama and Texas each 12; and Kentucky, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Wisconsin each 11; California, Mississippi, and New Jersey produced each 9, and Connecticut 8.

Twenty-seven and six-tenths per cent were born in places of less than 50,000 population, and 72.6 per cent in centers of larger size. Of the latter, only 70, or 14 per cent of the whole number whose birthplaces were determined, were born in cities of over 100,000. In 1890 (the median year of birth of the presidents) the population of the United States residing in communities of 100,000 or more was 15.4 per cent.

As to the educational backgrounds of the presidents of American colleges, it is of interest to note that only 7 were not recipients of the bachelor's degree. Sixty earned in course no degree higher than the bachelor's degree, not including, however, the 31 who received

the B.D. degree as a graduate degree and the 9 who took the LL.B. as a second degree after graduation and went no farther. Besides these latter there were also 135 whose highest degree in course was that of the master, so that 175 continued their university work beyond the undergraduate degree to what may be regarded as the masterate. The largest number of college presidents continued their formal education to the doctorate, 245 having earned that degree in course. Only 7 seem to have received the degree of engineer, of whom 5 had previously graduated with a bachelor's degree and 2 did not indicate in their biographies whether the degree was undergraduate or graduate in nature. Represented as percentages 1.4 per cent received no college degree, 12 per cent went no farther than their first college degree, 26.7 per cent received the master's degree as the final degree, 6.3 per cent received a second degree of bachelor of divinity, 18 per cent continued to the bachelor of laws degree, and 49.6 per cent received a doctor's degree in course, and 1.4 per cent received the degree of engineer. Of the 115 who became college presidents in 1942 and later, 72 had earned the doctorate, or 62 per cent. Among the 116 appointed before 1932, 39 had obtained their doctorate, nearly 33 per cent. Whether this increase in the relative number of college presidents who have earned the doctorate in course indicates simply the increase over the years in the number of students who continue to the doctorate or not is difficult to say.

III

Further light is thrown upon the nature of the college president by a consideration of the callings which he followed before attaining his present position in the academic world. Of the 488 whose previous occupations were indicated in their biographies, 231 were taken from the faculties of colleges or universities, or 47.3 per cent. Sixty-eight, or 13.9 per cent, were taken from the ministry and priesthood. One hundred thirty-five, or 27.7 per cent, came from positions of administration in colleges, including presidencies of other institutions; this figure excludes those whose biographical notices indicated only part-time administration. Twenty-five, or 5 per cent, were recruited from among administrators and teachers

in secondary schools and school systems; 42, or 4.5 per cent, from the ranks of business, law, and journalism; and 7, or less than 1.5 per cent, from the ranks of officers in the Army and Navy.

If we eliminated from our figures the presidents who were in their present posts before 1930 and those who have been in their present posts only since 1943—approximately one-third of the total number—the percentage changes in the different occupational backgrounds is not striking. Those appointed to their present posts during the period 1930-34, during the period 1935-39, and during the period 1940-42, respectively, were recruited from college faculties to the extent of 45, 44, and 49 per cent, respectively; from the ministry 12, 15, and 9 per cent; from college administrative positions 28, 31, and 32 per cent; from secondary school positions 6, 5, and 3 per cent; from business positions 5, 3, and 4 per cent and from the Armed Services 2, 2, and 3 per cent. The fact that no secondary school men were appointed to college presidencies prior to 1915 and no business men prior to 1925 would seem to indicate that prior to these dates the preparation, the training and the experience in these walks of life were not regarded as a good preparation for a college presidency. The fact that of the college presidents now in service none were recruited from the Armed Services prior to 1930 is probably explained by the fact that men in the Armed Services are not available for an academic appointment until after their retirement from the Armed Services, so that they are fairly well advanced in age when they become college presidents and do not hold these positions for many years. The decline in the percentage of ministers who are appointed to college presidents is undoubtedly the result of the general secularization of higher education which has been going on for many years.

The institutions from which the college presidents graduated are distributed throughout the nation. There are 267 different colleges whose graduates are presidents of colleges. Approximately 23 per cent of the presidents hold these positions at their Alma Maters. Harvard is the Alma Mater of 11 and Yale and Mercer each of 8 of the college presidents. Chicago, Princeton, and Worcester have supplied 7 each; Emory, Oberlin, Richmond, and Wesleyan 6 each; Colgate, Mississippi College, Northwestern, Ohio State, St. Louis, Stanford, and Wisconsin, 5 each. The total

number of college presidents who graduated from relatively small institutions, namely, Mercer, Worcester, Richmond, Wesleyan, and Mississippi College is interesting.

In conclusion it may be said that although the college president in recent years has had to assume a number of duties which only by the widest extension of the term can be said to be of concern to the intellectual life of the college, there is no indication that up to the time of this study there was any notable change in the scholarly preparation of presidents as evidenced by their earned degrees or that there had been any marked tendency to recruit business executives to administer the affairs of the college. To this generalization there are of course some notable and in some cases regrettable exceptions,

THE RÔLE OF LOGIC IN CONTEMPORARY EDUCATION

By MARIE T. COPP

Wilson College

One of the principal problems of education, in both its technical sense and in the broader reaches of shaping the general opinions of the public, is the superbundance of material to be digested and evaluated. The organization of the curriculum on the higher levels of education already is faced by almost insoluble conflicts in trying to give place to a variety of subjects, all making claims to an importance that no one can gainsay. This is symptomatic of a condition in the development of our culture which nothing can stem—unless the culture itself disintegrates. Knowledge proliferates knowledge, and, with all the modern means of communication and the emphasis on publicity, the entire public is bombarded, as never before, with the results of every kind of research and activity. This exposure naturally causes the public to demand instruction in every new field, so that the schools must struggle to crowd a vast and unmanageable mass of subject matter into the limits of time and practical handling that organized education can afford. Unless some effective principle of economy is used, the outcome must be arbitrary selection, with a resultant intensification of specialization and an increasing lack of balance and coherence in our intellectual situation. If we do not find a powerful instrument of simplification and order, then the very overweight of material will cause the breakdown of the civilization that has produced it.

The seriousness of the situation lies much deeper than the inertia and conservatism natural to any large and highly organized institution, such as our school system. It is a crisis of civilization which requires, not just a wiser selection of essential ingredients, but the use of an instrument that can reduce each subject matter to

its essentials, and give to individuals the power to simplify and evaluate for themselves. Such an instrument does exist, and at least a part of the confusion with which we are faced arises out of the fact that it has been neglected. This instrument is logic.

II

Logic, even in the restricted traditional form of Aristotle, is a valuable discipline for the criticism and evaluation of material, and likewise for sound and effective processes of creative thinking. The understanding and mastery of its basic techniques is relatively easy, and the application of them to all areas of knowledge is so obvious that the elementary student quickly sees their relevance and begins to use them. Though there are generally admitted limitations to the Aristotelian doctrine, like the limitations in the Newtonian principles of physics in modern science, it still is the significant means of handling a great portion of the immediate and common stuff of our experience. We still talk with subjects and predicates, confuse ourselves with conceptual ambiguities, order our thinking by causes and consequences, and fall victim to errors in the distribution of our terms in deduction. To understand the simple, structural relations among the terms of our thought will protect us from an immense amount of specious argument that still is cast in Aristotelian forms. When the necessities of our thinking demand a more flexible and comprehensive instrument, we shall be better able to understand the reasons for the new instrument and construct and use it better, if we are well-grounded in the old.

The reasons for our neglect of logic are fairly clear. Education has been trying to keep pace with the production of new subject matter. The emphasis on content has made us lose sight of, and lose faith in, the importance and efficacy of discipline in our thought processes. We have placed the responsibility for meaning and coherence in the facts we deal with, and the result is that the multiplicity of facts overwhelms us. Having externalized the criteria of knowledge, we inevitably weaken the powers of judgment and produce a conflict in the educational situation by telling our students that we desire them to think for themselves, while at

the same moment by our insistence that they amass a larger and larger amount of information we make it impossible for them to think. The same conflict is exemplified in our teaching. The instructor refuses to commit himself to the expression of an opinion and retreats into the barren, but safe, fastnesses of what he calls the objective presentation of factual material. A vicious circle results which seldom allows the participants in the educational process to take stock and evaluate the significance of what they are dealing with, because attention is wholly concentrated upon the ever-expanding circumference of more content.

The reason for this lies not entirely in the rapid production of knowledge, but also in the fact that most individuals are bewildered by the lack of any adequate instrument of criticism, simplification, and order. Most people have forgotten, or have never known, that there are structural and dynamic principles underlying all our thought, and that an understanding of these will enable us to see what is valid and what is invalid in the connecting and handling of facts. Instead of recognizing the internal laws of thought, we have made ourselves more and more dependent upon some external agency to meet the needs of selection and judgment for us. We cannot read all the books and so we rely upon the names of a few persons, whose prominence we recognize, to do our selecting for us. The Book-of-the-Month plan has expanded from volumes to be read for enjoyment, which can serve as common material for current conversation, to selections of the classics, of science, of religion, and detective stories. Periodical literature is reduced to digests, the news to capsule form in weekly journals, and the measure of our success in keeping pace with the whole is established by tests of identification and the truth and falsity of statements. All this is a superficial method for dealing with the superabundance of material that we feel is important and that we can find no way to cope with by ourselves. Our resultant culture is trivial, artificial, and dangerous, because it makes us more and more dependent upon someone else to determine what ideas we shall receive in forming our judgments. Such dependence devitalizes the intellect, and is inimical to democratic civilization.

III

The alternative to such methods is to awaken and train the critical and constructive faculties of individuals. Very probably one of the causes for the neglect of logic comes from the generally accepted arguments against the transfer of training from one subject to another; but logic involves no transfer of training. It is concerned with the structure of our thought in any field whatsoever. An understanding of the laws of validity and invalidity applies everywhere that ideas are related. The mind thinks this way in any case, but to become aware of what it is doing, and to be able to recognize when slips are made, will give to the thinker a confidence and independence that will make him less vulnerable to propaganda and to the emphases of an "authority" whose prestige is not founded on reason. A vast amount of propaganda and destructive prejudice could be rendered wholly innocuous by the demonstration of its logical invalidity. Logic is not a substitute for knowledge, but it is an exceedingly effective and economical means of clearing an immense number of needless obstacles from the path of constructive thinking.

Even in a one-semester course in traditional logic, in which there is little opportunity to gain facility by practice, students are amazed that they could have been "taken in" before by some of the articles and editorials in newspapers. With no coercion, but just because they see, they begin to judge the cogency of material presented to them from all sources. What happens to them in one semester, when most of the time must be taken for grasping the meaning of the rules, could be stabilized and developed into a permanent skill by a little more application and practice. This would mean that they themselves would possess the power to single out the essential from the inessential, that they could reject the specious, could clear away the confusions that arise from illegitimate questions, and both recognize and introduce order in the masses of material they handle.

It is indisputable that it is far easier to assimilate and retain what one understands than to discipline oneself to memorize a collection of unrelated bits of information. Whatever the intention of instructors, it is certainly far too widely true that a large part of the

educational process is a cramming of undigested facts to meet the demands of an examination, and then a revulsion and casting away of this too hastily engorged material. The fault does not lie primarily with the students, but with the general practice of education. The students need a discipline of mind to reveal to them the capacities and power of thought, to sharpen their discrimination, and to give them a sense of confidence in judgment. This discipline will be effective for anything they do, and, because their own understanding has been challenged and made active in the assimilation and ordering of material, they will retain much more of it and find it ready for their use in thinking beyond the limits of their formal instruction.

IV

This last statement points to the second great value of logic. Not only is it the means for critical selection and organization of knowledge already achieved, but the structural character of its principles can reveal the possibilities for further development. All hypotheses and theories are constructed by its means, then tested by appeal to facts. In a time when we are faced by a great variety of problems that have no close counterpart in the past, it is especially important that the greatest possible number of people should be aware of the processes by which new theories and new instruments of practice are developed. The need for a clearer definition of basic concepts, and for thinking through the implications of different lines of action before we commit ourselves to them, is obvious to everyone—in the fields of international and domestic politics, for instance. Training in logic will give a greater patience, a more intelligent sympathy, and a much broader basis for understanding participation in the issues of the time. This is crucial for a democracy. Of even greater importance than the preservation of any single system of social practice, it is essential for the survival and growth of civilization that a sufficient proportion of individuals should maintain confidence in rational endeavor and be capable of finding their way intelligently, economically, and effectively through the mazes of the modern world.

Restoring logic to a central position in education will not solve

all of the problems referred to in this article, but it would contribute greatly to their solution. Since logic is an instrument already existing in workable form with a history of demonstrated application, restoring it to a central position in education would be a step relatively easy to take. Furthermore, its techniques are simple enough to be grasped and to become effective in a relatively short time. The deeper problems of logic call for profound thinking, but a general understanding of the elementary rules and principles would clear away a vast amount of confusion and free the constructive capacities of many individuals for more intelligent, hence more confident, participation in the work which the contemporary world demands.

EDUCATING THE HEART

By ROBERT BERKELMAN

Bates College

John Stuart Mill, the English political philosopher, wrote his autobiography over three-quarters of a century ago; but its account of the rigorous education given him at home by his eminent father reveals truths that are even more deeply significant for our day than for his own.

Soon after he learned to walk, John was taught Greek, so that at the age of seven he could read Plato's dialogues. At eight he began Latin. By his twelfth year he had marched through scores of histories, among them tomes by Plutarch, Hume, and Gibbon. But such books of amusement as *Robinson Crusoe*, *Arabian Nights*, and *Don Quixote* were allowed only sparingly. Between the ages of eight and twelve, instead, he studied chemistry, mathematics, and Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, and continued not only to read history but also, for practice, to write enough on Roman government to fill a volume. Since his father, a leader of the Utilitarians, did not greatly admire Shakespeare and cared little for English poetry outside Milton and neglected the current output of the Romanicists, the son devoted little time to such literature of the sensibilities.

At twelve he sharpened his mind on syllogistic logic, which he enjoyed because it was even more intellectually challenging than mathematics. Soon he became so proficient in dissecting fallacious argument that he acquired among his young acquaintances a reputation for conceit.

In the meantime the father took pains to balance the boy's book learning with enough exercise to keep him in good health, though he learned to play no games. Also they carefully emphasized sound reasoning rather than the mere memorizing of inert facts. But most of the education, the boy came to realize, was theoretical, and fitted him to know rather than to do. Nor was

there any religious training, for the father, an agnostic, deplored the orthodoxy of the 1820's as a stumbling block to true morality. By far the largest share of young John's education thus went into cultivating his analytical and rational powers, and he either ignored his feelings or muffled them as an obstacle to clear reasoning.

The grievous flaw in this unbalanced program finally came to light in a personal crisis. For years he had been trained to function as a political and social reformer. Now, in his twenty-first year, this would-be healer of the world's troubles discovered that he himself was deeply in need of reform, for he slumped into a state of dull apathy that dragged on for weeks. Rather than disappoint his father, he tried to keep his condition secret.

One day, in the midst of these spiritual doldrums, he bluntly asked himself: "Suppose that all your objects in life were realized; that all the changes in institutions and opinions which you are looking forward to, could be completely effected at this very instant: would this be a great joy and happiness to you?" His answer was "No!" "At this," his autobiography confesses, "my heart sank within me: the whole foundation on which my life was constructed fell down." For months the clouds of ennui hung over him and grew heavier. Thus at the very beginning of what was to have been an auspicious voyage, he was utterly becalmed.

Eventually, probing to the cause of his distemper, he found it in his education. "For I now saw . . . that the habit of analysis has a tendency to wear away the feelings. . . . Analytic habits are favorable to prudence and clear-sightedness, but a perpetual worm at the root both of the passions and of the virtues; and, above all, fearfully undermine all desires and all pleasures. . . I had now learnt by experience that the passive susceptibilities needed to be cultivated as well as the active capacities."

Accordingly he set out to achieve balance. He derived pleasure from music, especially Weber's *Oberon*, but it seemed short-lived. He sought relief but discovered none in the books that had been his favorites. To dissipate the fog he took to reading Byron, but disliked his poetry as the uncomfortable lament of a man who, erring in the other extreme, had given his feelings free rein and had worn out all the pleasures.

Finally he found in Wordsworth that counterpoise of thoughtfulness and passionate enjoyment that brought back his own zest for living. "What made Wordsworth's poems a medicine for my state of mind," the autobiography testifies, "was that they expressed, not mere outward beauty, but states of feeling, and of thought colored by feeling, under the excitement of beauty. They seemed to be the very culture of the feelings, which I was in quest of."

II

This private education that had unhappily placed too much emphasis upon rationality and too little upon the emotions was uncommon in Mill's generation. Science had still to make its way into the curriculum and to put an even heavier emphasis upon fact-finding and reasoning. Since then, however, thanks to such as Thomas Huxley and his pupil H. G. Wells, science has earned its appropriate place in the educational sun; and within two generations its successes have caused the scientific attitude to spread like a dark stain through all our thinking.

This scientific approach, in fact, has become fully as epoch-making as the machines that science has invented. Scientific analysis now probes everything. Years ago it scrutinized the Bible and cross-examined the saints; now it detects the lies of criminals. It computes the fluctuating popularity of radio comedians and of political hopefuls. It straps a gadget on the pulse to measure reactions to advertising or to movies; it counts the housewife's steps to design a perfect kitchen. And all these activities, granted, may be quite desirable. To gainsay the importance of scientific method or to begrudge its victories is certainly far from the aim of this essay.

But the scientific attitude, especially when assumed by beings devoid of a sense either of humor or of proportion, has often been guilty of beclouding the truth. Often it loses sight of the tulip while counting its streaks. Too frequently literary scholars, for example, hankering for the prestige of the scientists, turn literature into a sterile kind of archeology, digging up and classifying dead facts not worth knowing. Occasionally sociologists and psychol-

ogists, seeking to redeem the inexactness of their sciences, disguise their truths with a pretentious mantle of scientific jargon. The scientific mind-set, indeed, has grown to the fearful proportions of Frankenstein's creation and through no intention of the scientists themselves has taken on some of the monster's behavior.

Most important of all, the scientific method has developed such a magical efficiency in gaining accumulative and tangible results that we onlookers drift into a habit of worshipful respect for it. Young students of science, especially, tend to conclude that science is the be-all and the end-all, that its aim—to be objective, impersonal, and dispassionate—is the sole aim of a good education. They forget that training which is exclusively scientific leaves its product a mere tool. Like the German scientists who worked for the Nazis, they grow so absorbed in the means that they blindly ignore all purposes and ends.

Even students who are not specializing in any science come to suspect all feeling as unintelligent bias. So complete is their faith in science that they become skeptics in everything else. In the scientific spirit we teach them to ferret out emotional bias, but neglect to cultivate in them any deeply felt convictions. We train them to analyze everything into fragments, but spend little time showing them how to put together those fragments into meaningful wholes. They become, as a result, ingeniously critical but pitifully uncreative. Perhaps we have forgotten that rationality is a good light but a poor fire; it can illuminate the way, but, as young Mill discovered, it cannot warm us and it does not stir us to action.

Those students who pride themselves on their hardheadedness are resolved that there is something shamefully flabby and effeminate about refining the tastes. In this scientific age the sensibilities are either stamped out or left to run riot. As a result we have thousands of high-school and college students who, when they tolerate poetry at all, prefer either matter-of-fact, business-like moralizing (such as Kipling's "If," the favorite of Princeton graduates) or the emotional mush on which many of the crooned love songs are based. Such students divorce thinking and feeling. Thinking is for serious work; feeling is only a steam to be let off at jitterbugging or pulling up goal posts.

The scientific type that can be so cool and rational in the laboratory often prefers raw melodrama on the radio or the lurid comics (which are anything but comic). Fifteen years ago German education was as scientific as that of any nation on earth; yet its scientific training did not keep German students from succumbing to the demagogue's emotionalism.

To compute anyone's mental age we give him an intelligence test; to determine his emotional age we need simply to watch him laugh. I recall a pointed instance. One afternoon there came into a movie theater, while the lights were still on, a shabby man whose bald head revealed several warts and knobs, like that of the kindly priest in Ghirlandaio's "Old Man and Child." The boys in the balcony, who were presumably being educated only an hour or two earlier in the day, began making wisecracks about the man and moved each other to snickers and uproarious mirth. Eventually they leaned over the railing and shot paper planes at the funny head. But these boys were still in their teens.

What of the emotional level of college students? Well, some years ago, in a college chapel, a student singer rose in the corner of the choir stall to sing her solo part. She was so short that when she stood up only her face showed, like a robin peering from the nest. Most of her fellow students decently kept their amusement to themselves, but many others, oblivious of her deepening blush, tittered and finally guffawed with the loud laughter that bespeaks the ignorant heart. The girl never again attempted a solo. Could there be something deeply wrong with the education that leaves undeveloped such a crass sense of humor?

But enough of carping. What can be done? What does our education need in this area?

III

First, we need both parents and teachers who realize that valuable though logical thinking is, it is also of prime importance to cultivate refined sentiment, warm convictions, and a wise and understanding heart. Intellect is precious, but it is not enough. Let the teachers of all those subjects possessing emotional content remember that it is their special province to help mould the tastes

of their students, taking reassurance from Ruskin's belief that "taste is not only a part and an index of morality—it is the *only* morality." The students should be made to feel, without being insulted or lectured with offensive directness, that living in the Age of Science does not automatically make people civilized. Persons who love crude jokes and crude emotions are inwardly living in the Stone Age.

Our generation can also learn from Goethe's Faust, without repeating his blunders, the profound lesson that head and heart must work together, that in the wholly mature person the intellect must carefully select the emotions worth cultivating, and the emotions must energize the intellect. At the beginning of Goethe's masterpiece, we may remember, the scholarly Faust finds himself in a slough of disillusionment much like that which caught John Stuart Mill. He has done his utmost to develop his brain, but all his massive learning is dwindling to the dust and ashes of frustration because he has neglected all his other humanizing capacities. Hoping to right matters he rashly turns his back upon intellect and dedicates himself to the emotions:

Hearken! The end I aim at is not joy.
I crave excitement, agonizing bliss,
Enamor'd hatred, quickening vexation.
Purg'd from the love of knowledge, my vocation,
The scope of all my powers henceforth be this,
To bare my breast to every pang. . .

Only after bringing prolonged suffering upon himself and upon Margaret and many others does he finally come to realize that the head and the heart must be collaborators, not enemies or even rivals. The brain must guide the heart, and the heart must enrich the brain. Faust achieves wisdom and happiness only when his feelings have been directed to an unselfish cause of which his mind can approve.

Toward fusing powerfully the intellectual and the emotional, good literature, whether or not it conveys the point as directly as Goethe's dramatic poem, can be one of the most valuable educative influences, perhaps even more than music, painting, or the other fine arts. Mill and his father should have read Hazlitt's essay on *Othello*. There they would have been reminded that

tragedy "is a refiner of the species, a discipline of humanity. . . . Science alone is hard and mechanical. It exercises the understanding upon things out of ourselves, while it leaves the affections unemployed."

The literature, however, must be chosen, not merely for its demonstration of bygone literary trends, but rather for its immediateness (whatever its period) to the lives of the present students. And it must be taught wisely, not pedantically. In discussing poems the teacher should be as much concerned with getting the students to appreciate intelligently the emotions expressed as with condensing the meaning or analyzing the technique. Let them savor the mingled feelings, for instance, in such poems as Robinson's "Mr. Flood's Party" and such sensitive essays as Lamb's "Dream Children." Let them try to draw clear distinctions between sentiment and sentimentality, between genuine pathos and "tear-jerking," between tragedy and melodrama, and they may grow to understand that mature feeling must always be compatible with mature thinking and good sense.

Students need to learn discrimination among feelings and tastes. "Tell me what you like," said Ruskin, "and I'll tell you what you are." And Goethe, who was an active scientist as well as a great poet, declared that "a teacher who can arouse a feeling for one single good action, for one single good poem, accomplishes more than he who fills our memory with rows on rows of natural objects, classified with name and form."

Not all the literature should be exclusively aesthetic. The scientific type might be tempted with the writings of such as William Beebe, Roy Chapman Andrews, and John Burroughs, and with that glowing autobiography of a physicist, Michael Pupin's *From Immigrant to Inventor*. He may even discover that one can be an eminent scientist and also possess a high regard for polished writing, for intelligent sentiment, and for beauty.

To balance the surfeit of training received in analysis and criticism, perhaps all students, especially the matter-of-fact ones, should be urged to express their feelings in music, in painting or sculpture, in acting or in creative writing. When they are studying sonnets they might be obliged to create one of their own. The tangible result may be negligible, but the active effort, better than

much fine interpretation, will teach them a more wholesome respect for the sonnets of young Keats. Students of Shakespeare, instead of devoting all their time to absorbing historical criticism and textual analysis, should attempt some blank verse of their own, and should read many passages aloud until they can do some justice to the rich characterizations and to the emotional content. This is appreciating Shakespeare *from the inside*, and it is also exercising that blend of thought and feeling that young Mill so sorely lacked.

The sooner we get firm hold of Pascal's conviction that "we know the truth, not only by the reason, but also by the heart," the sooner we may impart to the rising generation more of sane balance, sense of proportion, and dynamic faith. Whatever we can do to awaken the heart and guide the emotions, whatever we can do to support keen, cold analysis with warm conviction should make our younger generation more sensitive to beauty, more aware of conscience, richer in spirit, wiser in understanding, more full of life and fire than their hypercritical, skeptical, blasé elders have been.

THREE PATTERNS OF LIVING

By FRANK DAVIDSON

Indiana University

A scientist asserted in a recent number of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors that "our real job as teachers" is "to cultivate a well-balanced appreciation of values, to teach what is most worth while in life and how to go about to achieve it."¹ Walt Whitman once spoke of the acquisition of appreciation of values as prudence and clarified his peculiar meaning of the word with a line suggestive of the Scriptures, "that the young man who composedly periled his life and lost it has done exceeding well for himself, while the man who has not periled his life and retains it to old age in riches and ease has perhaps achieved nothing for himself worth mentioning." Centuries ago Jesus gave a lesson in the appreciation of values in his parable of the Good Samaritan, the Levite, and the Priest. "Which of these three," he asked, "thinkest thou, was neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves?" The scientist, Whitman, and Jesus properly imply values beyond the material ones. And our experiences daily testify to the truth of their implications.

With these observations in mind, let us project a problem in values. Jonathan Edwards, Benjamin Franklin, and John Woolman, three eighteenth century Americans, each left an autobiographical statement expressive of his personal pattern of living. What is the relative value of their contributions to those of us who are interested in "what is most worth while in life" and who would know "how to go about to achieve it?"

II

Jonathan Edwards, born in 1703, was of the Connecticut pulpit aristocracy. He was a man of culture. A prodigy of learning and

¹ C. Judson Herrick, "A Liberal Education," Autumn, 1945, Vol. 31, No. 3, p. 356.

of logical thinking, he was writing scientific essays at twelve. He kept an interest in science—biological and psychological—throughout his life, but always in a position subordinate to that of theology and religion. Both his scientific and his religious bents made him sympathetic with the natural world about him. To some extent it was revelatory of God, though it was not God. After one particular experience he expressed his insight into nature as a poet might, suggesting a beauty there beyond the merely physical.

God's excellence [he muses], his wisdom, his purity and love, seemed to appear in every thing; in the sun, moon, and stars; in the clouds, and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, trees; in the water, and all nature; which used greatly to fix my mind. . . . And scarce any thing, among all the works of nature was so delightful to me as thunder and lightning; formerly, nothing had been so terrible to me. Before, I used to be uncommonly terrified with thunder, and to be struck with terror when I saw a thunder storm rising; but now, on the contrary, it rejoiced me. I felt God, so to speak, at the first appearance of a thunder storm; and used to take the opportunity, at such times, to fix myself in order to view the clouds, and see the lightning play, and hear the majestic and awful voice of God's thunder. . . .

As one might surmise from the passage, Edwards had an interest in esthetics—in both the theoretical and practical phases. Disturbed while still a youth by the terms *ugly* and *beautiful*, as men applied them to objects, he studied to learn the basis of such differentiation. By designs of his own creation he discovered that proportion was a fundamental factor, but still he was not satisfied. He would know why things properly proportioned affect the mind as beautiful and the disproportioned as ugly. His investigation led him at length to the inference that proportion is characteristic of Being, that disproportion is a negation of Being. In his writing he employed artistic devices that make for effective communication. Even in such a theological monstrosity as *Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God* he is powerful, and stimulates one's sense of beauty through his logic, his rhythmic repetition of motives, his simple figures, and his direct appeal. He employs these devices, as a painter might use line and color, to focus the reader's attention on the man who, steeped in sin, hangs by a slender thread over a bottomless pit.

His greatest fault, perhaps, lay in his permitting himself to be deflected from his idealistic and mystical consideration of life to become, in such sermons, a defender of Puritan theology. But Arminianism and Deism, which for him were but rationalizings instead of faiths, were making inroads on the religion of the fathers. Since by training he had the logical method that belongs to an advocate, he spoke, though temperamentally he was not fitted for the task. Nor was he religiously. For he had proceeded as far beyond doctrinal Calvinism as Emerson in 1833 had beyond doctrinal Unitarianism.

His strength lay in his idealism and in his mysticism; and by what he suggests to us in these fields he should be remembered. As idealist he developed views similar to those of his English contemporary Berkeley. The physical universe was for him but an idea of God made manifest to man. Reality was in the idea rather than in the manifestation, even as reality of one of our thoughts is in the thought rather than in its spoken or written form. Emerson, later, found the view attractive and gave a chapter to idealism in his essay *Nature*. Our own contemplation of that view might be a corrective today for a too rampant materialism. At one point in his discussion of Being, Edwards stated "that those beings, which have knowledge and consciousness, are the only proper and real, and substantial beings; inasmuch as the being of other things is only by these. From hence, we may see the gross mistake of those, who think material things the only substantial beings. . . ."

He was, as I have said, a mystic; that is, he had a sense at times of being in the immediate presence of deity, of undergoing for the moment an experience that had a reality not given by sensory contact with a material environment, of knowing a spiritual ecstasy that was beyond words to express. Here is his own account:

Once as I rode out into the woods for my health, in 1737, having alighted from my horse in a retired place, as my manner commonly has been, to walk for divine contemplation and prayer, I had a view that for me was extraordinary, of the glory of the Son of God, as Mediator between God and Man, and his wonderful, great, full, pure and sweet grace and love, and meek and gentle condescension. This grace that appeared so calm and sweet, appeared also great above the heavens. The person of Christ appeared

ineffably excellent with an excellency great enough to swallow up all thought and conception—which continued, as near as I can judge, about an hour . . .

I am not a mystic; nor am I one to say that the mystic's experience is not a valid one. If we come forward a century from this confession of Edwards, we find a somewhat parallel one in Emerson:

Standing on this bare ground [he says], —my head bathed by the blithe air, and uplifted into infinite space, —all mean egotism vanishes. I become a transparent eyeball; I am nothing; I see all; the currents of the Universal Being circulate through me; I am part or parcel of God.

"To the sceptic," says a modern Emersonian scholar,

all mysticism will seem to be, more than likely, only one more illusion. And one more illusion it may be. Or it may be, potentially, a deepening and extension of the conscious life beyond the familiar limits, a veritable enrichment of experience which the sceptic may reasonably take cognizance of and consider. He can do so, however, only at first hand. For mysticism, really to be known, must be known from within.

In any evaluation of Edwards with reference to "what is most worth while in life" we must keep in mind the mystic Edwards. And remembering what mystics have contributed to man's cultural heritage—Teresa of Avila, Catherine of Siena, Robert Southwell, William Blake, William Wordsworth, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Francis Thompson, and William Vaughn Moody—we must not dismiss too hastily the Connecticut Puritan.

Though sympathetic with the medieval manner of exalting the spirit and abasing the flesh, Edwards was not ascetic. He functioned as a tutor at Yale; fell in love, married, and reared a large family; preached for a quarter century at Northampton; labored as a missionary among the Indians in western Massachusetts; and shortly before his death accepted appointment to the Presidency of the College of New Jersey.

He was logical and profound in his thinking, idealistic, deeply spiritual and devout, mystical—capable of making men realize that

they are more in their composition than what shows between hat and boot soles. He is reminiscent of that strain in human thought which produced *Everyman*, "My Mind to Me a Kingdom Is," and "Litany in Time of Plague." It may be summarized in Nashe's lines:

Heaven is our heritage
Earth but a player's stage.

III

Benjamin Franklin, born three years later than Edwards, was of a family that for generations had lived by the sweat of its brow. He was reared in a faith similar to that of Edwards but was so attracted by the physical scene about him as to adapt himself quickly to it and its ways. Like his ancestors for generations back, he was bred to a trade through a long apprenticeship. That he became a journalist was not altogether accident. His Uncle Benjamin and his maternal grandfather had been versifiers, and his elder brother had become printer of the fourth newspaper set up in New England. Morevoer, he learned early that writing, if one has a mastery of it, is useful for creating and controlling the opinions of men. The story of his teaching himself to write is generally known. The motive was utilitarian. While in epistolary controversy with a friend, Collins, he showed his father some of the letters that had passed between them and was warned that, though he had the better ideas, Collins was winning through the advantage of effective form. So, Franklin made brief notes on paragraphs from the *Spectator*, cast the items of his outlines into disorder, and then, when he had forgot the words of his model, tried recasting the paragraphs. He could compare his with the originals. He reached a stage in his progress where he thought that his expression was at times an improvement on Addison's.

He came to be a writer of power in his appeal to men's intelligence. He never loses poise or control. But he seldom, if ever, stirs the emotions. With the exception of the *Autobiography*, which is charming in its seeming artlessness, his writing is marked by cleverness, wit, grace, charm, lucidity, urbanity, and irony. Of the last he became a master. In his pointed essay on *Rules by*

Which a Great Empire May Be Reduced he sets up a ridiculous objective (that one would want to reduce his empire); then he states with great economy twenty rules—all facts concerning British colonial policy—by which such an end may be attained. The implication is, of course, that the action of the English ministry is ridiculous. But whether the writing be a satire directed at a tyrannical government or a charming bagatelle addressed to Madame Helvétius, it has an enameled surface—smooth, glistening, durable, useful. For better or for worse, Franklin seldom leads a reader beyond depth.

His accomplishments through his eighty-four years are known in many languages. He invented a stove, bifocals, and lightning rods—all useful. He reorganized the British Post Office in America, put it on a paying basis, and through it helped to unify the colonies. He established a city police system, an efficient city fire control, a public hospital, and a subscription library, and helped materially in laying the foundation of the University of Pennsylvania. He organized a defense for his colony when it was threatened by the French and Indians, took a force of men to a wilderness frontier near Bethlehem and there directed the building of three forts, offered a plan of union for the colonies at the Albany Congress—a plan that he later thought, had it been adopted, might have prevented the Revolution, and, by collecting wagons, horses, drivers, and food supplies, made possible Braddock's tragic expedition into the back country with British troops. Then he served as diplomat in England and France for twenty-five years, as a member of the committee which drew the Declaration of Independence, and as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention. And these are but major items in his accomplishments.

He was no mystic, as was Edwards; nor was he spiritually minded. He supported the church as he supported other public institutions—because it had a social value and because supporting it had a social value. He had swung off on the bias of Deism in his youth, but had forsaken the course for practical reasons. Deism was unpopular with the majority of his townsmen, and his persistence in its somewhat radical doctrines might detract from his influence. Moreover, he had watched it in operation in two of his companions and in himself and had concluded that, though it

might be based in true principles, it was not useful. He expressed then, more or less conventionally, his belief in one God, who had made and who rules the universe, in immortality of the soul, in the punishment of evil and the rewarding of good. He advocated truth, sincerity, and integrity in dealing with men and thought the most acceptable service to God was one's doing good to men. Believing that a virtuous life has more chance of success than a nonvirtuous one, he made a chart of thirteen virtues, and, depending upon his own rationality and force of will, rather than on the grace of God, which had been an absolute with Edwards, he practiced each virtue in turn for a week and accomplished four rounds of the group in the fifty-two weeks of a year. His was a mathematical attempt at virtuous living. If Franklin failed at any time in some detail of his program, he did not dress in a hair shirt to do penance, but recorded the lapse, if it were serious enough, as an *erratum*. Neglect of his fiancée, Deborah Read, while he was in England, spending money that he had been authorized to collect for an acquaintance, and flirting with the English mistress of his friend James Ralph were three such entries.

Though Franklin's pattern of living was utilitarian, it was not basely utilitarian. For Franklin was more than mere craftsman; he was an artist of the utilitarian; that is, he had a vivid imagination, which permitted him to envision that which the hands might make for the more comfortable living of men. He could make lightning rods, for instance; but, while he was at the task, he could think of the electric currents that these rods would direct as an organic part of a complex world which might be simplified by man for his easier living. Then, too, in making a thing useful, he generally started with the larger objective of promoting order. One reads of such an end between the lines of his account of organizing the Post Office, and the police, and words on a page. Orderliness was one of his thirteen virtues, and by his own testimony one of the most difficult of attainment.

The Franklin cultural tributary has been more than a trickle in the current of American and of world thought and activity. I cannot assert that it has carried no obscuring sediment into the main stream. Its temperature has proved so attractive to modern man that he has relaxed in it perhaps more than he should. Frugality

in living is, I believe, the only essential part of the Franklin pattern that we have definitely forgot.

IV

The last of our trio, John Woolman, was born in 1720. Like Franklin, he was the son of parents who lived by the work of their hands; like Edwards, he turned to the ministry as a profession—the Quaker ministry. He had many of the characteristics of both his predecessors, all particularized by peculiar additions of his own. He was a humanitarian, as was Franklin, but from principle rather than from expediency.

That as the Mind is moved [he wrote], by an inward Principle, to love God as an invisible, incomprehensible Being, by the same Principle it was moved to love him in all his Manifestations in the visible World. That as by his Breath the Flame of Life has kindled in all sensible Creatures, to say that we love God [as unseen] and at the same time exercise cruelty toward the least Creature [moving by his life, or by life derived from Him], is a contradiction in itself.

All men—rich and poor, black, white, and red—were for him children of one father and possessed of immortal souls. No matter what their condition, they were his brothers and sisters. So, they drew from him a deep sympathy and a tender, unobtrusive, and practical helpfulness. When, after a visit into the South, he knew the conditions under which sugar was produced by slave labor, he left off sugar; after he learned that the lives of men and women employed in dyeing cloth were shortened by occupational disease, he wore his clothing plain. He was constantly watchful to avoid any luxury the production of which would cause his fellowman unnecessary labor. He made his principle applicable even to the cabin of a ship that carried him to England and so went steerage. “. . .the ideal which he sought,” wrote one critic, “was a society in which no man should need to profit by the degradation of his fellowmen.” One instance of his quiet methods of working among people sheds light on his character. About Christmas time of one year he was troubled by the drinking at the public-houses in his town, especially at one, where there was much disorder. “I

believed it was incumbent on me," he wrote, "to go and speak to the Master of that House." But modesty, timidity, and humility restrained him. Franklin practiced humility consciously at times for social ends; Woolman was humble from knowing himself an insignificant creature dependent on God.

... with Prayers and Tears [he continues], I besought the Lord for his Assistance, who, in Loving-kindness gave me a resigned Heart: then, at a suitable opportunity, I went to the Public-House, and, seeing the Man amongst much Company, I went to him, and told him, I wanted to speak with him; so we went aside, and there, in the Fear of the Almighty, I expressed to him what rested on my Mind; which he took kindly, and afterwards showed more Regard to me than before.

In this same mild fashion, over wilderness paths from Massachusetts to South Carolina, he worked among the Quakers who held slaves for the liberation of these involuntary servants. In monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, his simple earnestness was gradually effective with the whole brotherhood, and in individual cases it frequently brought immediate emancipation of a slave. Concerning one trip into Virginia and North Carolina he writes:

I saw in these Southern Provinces so many Vices and Corruptions, increased by this Trade and this Way of Life, that it appeared to me as a Gloom over the Land; and though now many willingly run into it, yet, in future, the Consequence will be grievous to Posterity.

Franklin took an interest in the slavery question even to the point, I believe, of becoming a member of one of the earliest abolition groups, but his concern was never so personal, so close and heart-felt as Woolman's.

The same distinction holds between the two men in their relationships with the Indians. Franklin went once to Carlisle, Pennsylvania, to help draw a treaty with the Red Men, and, realizing that they were extremely apt to get drunk and be quarrelsome and disorderly, forbade the selling of liquor to them. But when they complained of the resolution, "we told them," he says, "that

if they would continue sober during the treaty, we would give them plenty of rum when the business was over." Franklin describes the orgy that ensued after the rum was released, and then somewhat callously concludes:

... if it be the design of Providence to extirpate these savages in order to make room for cultivators of the earth, it seems not improbable that rum may be the appointed means. It has already annihilated all the tribes who formerly inhabited the sea-coast.

But Woolman was keenly aware of the suffering brought on the Indians by drink. He visualizes sympathetically the sequences of a scene such as had been merely picturesque to Franklin.

Their Skins and Furs [he says], gotten through much Fatigue and hard Travels in Hunting, with which they intended to buy Clothing, when they become intoxicated, they often sell at a low Rate for more Rum; and afterwards ... they suffer for want of the necessaries of Life Where cunning People pass Counterfeits, and impose that on others which is good for nothing, it is considered as a Wickedness; but to sell that to People which we know does them Harm, and which often works their Ruin, for the Sake of Gain, manifests a hardened and corrupt Heart, and is an Evil, which demands the Care of all true Lovers of Virtue to suppress

During the period when Franklin, with fifty or sixty men, was constructing forts against the Indians, Woolman, whose Quaker views on warfare Franklin liked to ridicule, was with a single companion threading his way into the same region to labor quietly among the Indians, alongside a Moravian missionary, to show them the advantages of Christian living.

Woolman had the spiritual depth of Edwards, without the latter's high intelligence, and so in his expression he appears less studied, with a straightforward, frank simplicity that is earnest for but one end—transmission of the truth. He knew the dangers bred of fluency of speech and was careful to avoid them. On one occasion he spoke fluently, but realized immediately afterwards that he had exhibited himself rather than the truth.

As I was thus humbled and disciplined under the Cross [he wrote],

my Understanding became more strengthened to distinguish the pure Spirit that inwardly moves upon the Heart, and taught me to wait in Silence, sometimes for many weeks together, till I felt that rise which prepares the creature to stand like a trumpet through which the Lord speaks to His flock.

Woolman had, also, much of the mystical insight and the devoutness that characterized Edwards. But he was more human, mingled more freely with men, understood and sympathized with their weaknesses.

Of these three eighteenth century Americans, two are almost forgotten. In comparison with their well-remembered contemporary, Franklin, do these two in their philosophies have any suggestions for us, equal to or surpassing his, of "what is most worth while in life and how to go about to achieve it?"

THE MUSICIAN AND THE DOCTOR'S DEGREE¹

By ROWLAND W. DUNHAM

University of Colorado

For several years musicians have been confronted by an increasingly urgent problem which they have met with a docile acquiescence, apparently unconcerned with its implications. This problem is the growing demand that they possess a Doctor's degree, nothing less. That such a demand should either be resisted or be met in some adequate manner has not seemed to occur to musicians generally. They have possibly felt powerless to combat the administrators who have brought about this condition. To succumb to an attitude of inferiority, understandable as it may be, is nevertheless only apologetic and completely inexcusable.

Musical training may be obtained from private teachers, conservatories, universities (including colleges), and teachers colleges. Since most students expect to become teachers, it is necessary for them to obtain degrees. Hence the usual choice of attending one of the last two in order to obtain their musical education.

In universities and teachers colleges the usual professional graduate degrees available are Master of Music, Master of Music Education, Master of Arts with a music major, Doctor of Philosophy in musicology or composition, and Doctor of Education with a major in music education, and for organists and church musicians the D.S.M.—Doctor of Sacred Music. For teachers in public education the Doctor of Education degree is being sought rather generally. The Doctor of Philosophy degree in Musicology may be secured in several universities and colleges. Adequate library facilities and competent teachers are luxuries that only the more generously endowed institutions can afford. The demand for musicolo-

¹ Reprinted through the courtesy of the *Music Journal*, July-August, 1947, Vol. V, No. 3.

gists still remains limited. Consequently, the few schools which offer work in this field for students are well able to supply the present needs. There is some difference of opinion about the musical composition as a major. Many purists insist that a Ph.D. must be based only on research; that since composition is a creative product it should not be accepted as a legitimate major. Nevertheless, there are several first-class universities in which such a course is pursued.

II

With ample opportunities to secure a doctorate in two fields, what is the situation for the musician whose talents and inclinations are entirely in the realm of Applied Music? At musical conventions this very real dilemma has been the center of much controversy for a number of years. Take the position of a pianist, for instance. After he has earned a Master of Music degree on the basis of advanced study and a recital (thesis) of considerable artistic merit, further progress in his specialty is denied him in so far as it may be applied towards a Doctor's degree. He may have neither the talent nor the inclination for advanced work in composition. Lengthy research in musicology would mean the expenditure of at least two years without special benefit in his pianism. Indeed he might be forced to abandon the keyboard entirely during this period. Other instrumentalists and singers are faced with the same problem.

A musician is therefore confronted with two choices. Either he must invest several thousand dollars and two years of precious time in order to secure a Ph.D. in a field that may be relatively inconsequential, or he must resist and deny the demand for such a degree as a qualification for a position commensurable with his actual qualifications.

In other professions and fields the situation is quite different. An engineer may do graduate work leading to the degrees Electrical Engineer, Civil Engineer, Chemical Engineer, or Architectural Engineer, each comparable to a Master's degree and accepted as the maximum requirement. A Master's degree in Business suffices for at least two-thirds of the nation's faculties in business schools

in the best universities. Few lawyers concern themselves over a Doctor of Laws degree, and you will find only an occasional Doctor of Medicine with a Ph.D. degree. Why, then, is the musician faced with the demand for a degree which may be of little practical value to him unless it is indicative of merit in his particular specialty?

When music entered the universities and colleges as a subject for specialized study, it came in the back door. Already it had occupied an obscure position as a cultural subject in the Bachelor of Arts curriculum of the college of liberal arts. As demands increased for larger aspects and more professional training, the universities simply added more applied music and theory, gradually offering the major in music and the Bachelor of Music Degree. As this expansion took place, the control of the situation was firmly held by the college where the development began. It is really no more logical for a college of liberal arts to maintain a professional curriculum in music than it would be for it to administer the curricula and facilities in engineering, business, law, or medicine. There are still but few universities where an entirely separate college of music has been established. Some maintain a college of fine arts of which music is a part. This also falls below the ideal if one regards music as a subject requiring and deserving its own administration and autonomy. The independent professional school of music constitutes a decided requirement for proper functioning of this art from an educational standpoint.

One factor which has materially affected the emphasis upon Doctor's degrees is the influx over a number of years of European musicians. It should be borne in mind that in Germany the only music degree available is the Ph.D., which is based on a great diversity of requirements in different universities. In addition to music, three related fields, philosophy, mathematics, and acoustics, form the bases of examinations. As Willi Apel states in the *Harvard Dictionary of Music*, "Some of the German dissertations are no longer and contain little more information than an American undergraduate's term paper. Others, on the other hand, are splendid contributions to musical research and often have the proportions of full-sized books." The foregoing statement makes it easy to understand the experiences most of us have had with German Doctors of Philosophy, who may have a deep and comprehen-

sive knowledge of music or, on the other hand, may be superficial and incompetent in the extreme.

We Americans are a gullible people, still impressed by foreigners who possess what appears to be skill and authority far above the qualifications of any of our own countrymen. Perhaps the most susceptible to this guile are the academicians in their ivory towers, to whom a Ph.D. means undoubted superiority. This attitude cannot be broken down by the explanations of any mere musician. It may be that we shall be driven to furnishing our students with opportunities to enter the sacred fold of the elect with some kind of a doctorate.

What is a musician? Those on the outside have but a vague understanding of the term. Is he a person thoroughly trained in musical structure (with all the details that this implies) and skilled enough in some branch of performance to enable him to obtain a firsthand knowledge of the literature? Or is he a person who has read "all about music" and listened to hundreds of radio programs and phonograph records? The second classification sounds quite fantastic to most of us, but let us look at its possibilities. It is indeed feasible for a person to make an exhaustive study of many books *about* music, to hear (even memorize superficially) a large repertoire of music in concerts, radio broadcasts, and recordings, and as a result to emerge with an ability to talk about and teach music with convincing authority. Such a person might logically proceed to secure a Doctor's degree as a musicologist. His acceptance in academic and even musical circles would then be unchallenged by the nonprofessional at least. His lectures based on second-hand material, suitably restated, could easily pass as the results of profound musical research—we all know musicologists who fit this description. Fortunately, the better American universities insist that their candidates for majors in musicology be competent musicians.

On the faculty of a midwestern university with a department of music in liberal arts was a really superior teacher of cello and theory, a composer of distinction. The dean called this man into his office one day to inquire when his Master's degree would be followed by a Doctor's degree. The cellist attempted to explain that he had been thoroughly trained in his subjects, that he was considered to

be successful and efficient in his teaching, that he could hardly afford to spend two years without income for such a project. The dean, after some hesitation, agreed to accept an alternative in the form of a "New York public recital in Town Hall under a recognized manager." This ultimatum would be ridiculous were it not so appalling.

In an address to the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Colorado John Erskine said, "The graduate school on this campus will probably grant a Doctor's degree to a student who will write an academic dissertation on some phase of the music of Beethoven. This you will award with feelings of satisfaction and pride. But let a man of the most superior talents ask you the right to earn a Doctor's degree by *playing* the music of Beethoven and you would scornfully refuse and suggest he depart from your presence."

I sat in the office of a teachers' agency listening to the president of a teachers college discuss various candidates that had been recommended. His first question regarding each musician named was, "Has he his Doctor's degree?" A reply in the affirmative satisfied him as to the complete qualification of the individual for the position of head of the music department. At no time did he ask if the person was a singer or an instrumentalist or if he knew anything whatever about the art of music or composition. If he secured a competent man for the position, it was unquestionably because the head of that agency was a person of integrity and common sense. Somehow I secretly hoped his choice would be a failure.

III

What can be done about this situation as it exists to-day in America? One thing we have been doing is resisting it. A professional without a Doctor's degree finds the door closed to him in many institutions where the salary and opportunity for congenial activity appear exceedingly attractive. No matter how superior his artistic capabilities and cultural background may be, he must seek other openings where this restriction does not exist. It is probable that there will be more rather than fewer colleges where this standard obtains as time goes on. Therefore, the policy

of resistance or the acceptance of the status quo is decidedly futile. While many of the older musicians without this prized guarantee of musicianship are able to secure and hold first-class positions, the younger men coming along are sure to find more and more difficulty. Obviously something should be done to remedy this condition.

Another way to furnish the required credentials for the musician is to make available an acceptable and adequate Doctor's degree that will include the field of applied music and possibly composition.

In England some universities grant the degree Doctor of Music at the completion of specified courses. In many cases performance is accepted as a basis. We reserve this as an honorary degree in America. If our universities offer a Doctor of Music degree, the already existing Master of Music in Applied Music would not necessarily have to be based on a lower standard than we presume to be the case at present.

All of the generally accepted requirements should be rigidly followed with the usual recital of high level of excellence. Some may ask, "What further can a pianist, for instance, accomplish for a doctorate?" The answer is one that administrators can devise. There should be additional study and demonstration of the complete literature covering all schools and styles. Ensemble experience might naturally be required in advanced sonata, trio, and quintet repertoire. There should be performances on many occasions and of various character to include the many phases of a completely equipped master pianist. In addition to a culminating public recital, a comprehensive examination could be devised that would certainly test the candidate in every particular. There is actually no difficulty in curricula or standards. We would, under such a plan, eliminate the Mus. Doc., *honoris causa*, except possibly in rare instances.

The academic world in our country has become completely obsessed with the idea that the Doctor's degree makes the academic man. For the musical profession to attempt to combat this specification would be as foolish as to try to evade income taxes. The situation is certainly complicated for the professional musician. He must either conform or reform along the lines of one of the two

alternatives suggested. That it is of vital concern is admitted by every one of us.

Unless we give thoughtful consideration to the growing demand by administrators for musicians with the Doctor's degree, we may perpetuate and increase our difficulties.

GILT FOR THE LILY

College Instruction Under the Spotlight

By THOMAS FRANCIS MAHER

Somewhere in the development of higher education there seems to have arisen a synonymous conception of scholarship and teaching ability. By the standards that have been established by the various accrediting agencies and by the individual colleges this seems to be an admitted fact. Qualitative norms of scholarship have been established in every area of study, and rightly so. And the end result has most certainly been the intellectual embellishment of even the least of our institutions of higher learning. But since these institutions are, in addition to being sanctuaries of wisdom and learning, the fountains of those very treasures, it becomes important to consider the effectiveness with which those treasures are imparted to their knowledge-starved populations. If, in the words of the late Cardinal Newman, a University by its name professes to teach universal knowledge, it would seem that teaching is a concomitant equally important to the universal knowledge concerned. It is to this concept of teaching that we would devote these few pages, and consider some of the pitfalls and obstacles that impede good teaching.

At the beginning it is important that the writer point out that he is *not* a teacher. It has been his good fortune, however, to have spent a considerable number of years in the classes of many excellent teachers and, as a college administrator, to have been associated with even more of them. In addition it has been his fortune to have been associated with the teaching functions of the United States Army, over a sufficient period and in such intimate fashion as to have acquired some ideas of teaching techniques, however elementary, which might be worthy of consideration at the college and university level.

College instructors are not engaged because they are, *per se*, instructors. The basic criterion of their worth is their scholastic at-

tainment in the field to which they are to be assigned. With this we cannot quarrel. But we must confess that if they are good instructors, for the most part it is because of natural endowment, environment, observation, experience, or self-application. It is most fortunate that the majority of our college teachers have attained fair success. But for those not so successful, for those who would not be qualified by either training or native ability on lower educational levels, the question of training becomes a matter of serious consideration as it affects the institution of which they are a part, their own self-development, and, above all, those eager minds who look to them for guidance and inspiration in the quest for knowledge.

Early in the war the Army realized that if it was to train the number of men required for modern combat and service it would require the services of far more teachers than civil life could conceivably supply. The obvious solution was to train as teachers the qualified experts it already had—to make the sergeant of unquestioned marksmanship ability capable of imparting his knowledge and skill to even the least receptive of trainees under his tutelage. No one who has undergone the rigors of war, and of an army training center, will claim that the system has operated with close to hundred per cent effectiveness. But it is to the lasting credit of those who administered the training, and of those who became the teachers, that some ten million men did receive sufficient training in such a variety of subjects as to win a war. Our thesis is not that there is close resemblance between military training and university study. It is simply that in the transmission of knowledge or information of any kind the ability to transmit shares equal importance with a knowledge of the subject at hand. In the case of the Army, as was undoubtedly true of the other services, a definite plan was first established and thereafter rigidly administered. The "bible" of this plan was a training manual entitled "Army Instruction." It is unfortunate that the educators and experts who assisted the Army in its compilation remained cloaked in anonymity, but to them, whoever they are, comes the gratitude of thousands for lessons well learned.

Looking now to the college teacher whose scholarship has far outrun his technique of effective expression and transmission,

I will offer in all humility, and with not a single individual in mind, some few points the observance of which has made teachers out of men far less qualified, intellectually, than the poorest of scholars. These points may be classified in two groups: (1) Attributes of the effective teacher—positive factors; and (2) Obstacles to effective teaching—negative factors.

Attributes of the Effective Teacher

The attributes of the effective teacher are many and varied. I shall venture to discuss a few of them.

Vitality. No one who lacks interest is receptive to learning. That is one of the first principles of teaching and learning. Yet throughout the length and breadth of the educational world class after class sits through lecture after lecture stifling one mental yawn after the other. To use a hackneyed expression—"the subject must be alive," whether it be Calculus or Current Events. Too often the nature of the subject is blamed for the lack of vitality, but in reality it is the nature of the teacher. What could be more prosaic than an assortment of bathroom brushes? Yet to listen to the brush salesman from the moment his foot is in the door, no jewel on the Lord's green earth can compare with the charm and utility of his wares. Education is salesmanship to willing customers. Yet often the teacher fails to get his foot to the intellectual doorstep of his class. It is not enough that he, in the fullness of his heart, lives and loves his chosen field. He must so show enthusiasm for his subject that those who look to him cannot help being affected by his spirit. How is it done? In as many ways as there are men. But if teaching and learning are to extend beyond the drone of a voice, it must be done, by any means short of the ridiculous. It must be done by every teacher who recognizes that his obligation is to those who have entrusted him with their time and fertile minds.

I have seen a law professor, as he lectured on the intricacies of implied acceptance in a unilateral contract, rise a full foot and a half from his chair, wave his arms in the breeze, as his voice seemed to be announcing Judgment Day. He typified the teacher who might stand on his head to capture the interest of his class, if neces-

sary; but capture it he would, and by the vitality he engendered, hold it. In a word, where interest wanes, learning never starts.

Clarity. Students do not come to college to be impressed. Our modern radio quiz experts are too effective in this department. Consequently, the materials presented must be as the noonday sun. Too often we hear the expression, "Well, that's college; it's there for you and you either get it or you don't." That would seem an excellent way to shift the responsibility and justify practically anything in the name of higher education.

The lecture should definitely be adapted to the educational level of the class. There is a sharp distinction between the Freshman Class and Graduate School, and either to deny or to ignore that fact is to shirk the prime responsibility of a teacher. It is really a simple matter to know when the material is going over the heads of the students. Simply to look at their confused facial expression or their lack of attention is sufficient warning. Perhaps such groups comprise those "dull students" that many a professor has complained of. Perhaps "dull" is the word, but it has been misapplied. The real teacher does not have to dazzle his class with his brilliance. Rather he shows that, while he is the master of his subject, his primary concern is helping them to learn.

The Oriental who coined the expression, "One picture is worth a thousand words," certainly had a point. American advertising has flourished by that thought. The explanation of the chemical reaction of soap, as a solvent, upon grease or carbon substance is all very well as an abstract theory, but nothing sells soap as well as a picture of a cake of it wrapped in splendor with a graphic picture of its accomplishments. The same may often apply to teaching. There is very little in the catalogue of human knowledge, no matter how abstract it may be, that cannot be clarified by illustration, analogy, or specific application. This may be spoon feeding; but if the word picture fixes the principle, bring on more spoons. The simple fact is that the "how, when, and where" of the subject, brought to the individual imaginations and capabilities of the students is the surest method of imbedding the principles which we study.

To express a thought is not a guarantee that it has been absorbed. To use all the color and sparkle of the King's English need be no

further guarantee. But to say it, and say it, and say it again is as certain a method as the constant practice of the trained athlete. *Repititio est mater studiorum!*

Tied up with the notion of Clarity is the further concept of Sequence. Among the overwhelming majority of the uninitiated the ideas that two and two makes four and night follows day are pretty much of an intellectual habit. We like to take our thinking "straight." People who still doubt that Truth is a product of the rubber industry call it Logic. It is hard to make this point clear except perhaps to ask a rhetorical question—Is there ever anyone in our class who fails to see the connection between what you have just said and what was said two minutes ago? If there is, let's blow the dust off our Logic book and investigate what is inside.

Visual Instruction. At the mention of visual aids the average college instructor thinks of himself as the spirited voice in the dark as the slides parade before his class. There are other visual aids. For one, there is the spotless blackboard behind his desk, the oldest visual aid of them all. "But my subject does not lend itself to the use of the blackboard." Unless he be a teacher of the blind, I dispute the point. Again let us refer to our Oriental and his "one picture." It is not that words cannot, in many cases, serve even better for expression than the blackboard. It is the effect on the class that matters; that subconscious question in each mind: "How do you suppose he will illustrate that point?" or "What will he do next?" or, to be slightly ridiculous, "Where did he ever learn to draw such diagrams on a blackboard?" At any rate, the use of a visual aid in this manner does create a response, however remote. Perhaps it can be that small stimulus between boredom and interest.

And so it goes through the whole catalogue of Visual Aids; the charts, models, maps, figures, and fancy trimmings. They taught an Army of men enough to win a war with such as those, in every department from housekeeping to housebreaking. And some came to call it "eye wash." Visual aids can certainly become a form of window dressing to hide a lack of knowledge and assurance. But if it fails in everything for which it was intended we must admit that it succeeds in attracting enough interest to support its particular use. If it does even that then it succeeds, because it has

brought relation and thought to the subject to which it is attached. When a man is interested, he learns.

Provocation. Except that I shudder at the hackneyed repetition of the word as it is used in educational jargon, I would title this section "Challenge." It amounts to the same thing, and boiled down to a college classroom comes to this question: Has anything said in the past hour made it an hour worth living? I do not ask that every class, even Invertebrate Anatomy, should end with a battle cry and the unfolding of a great vision. But students have been known to walk out of a classroom saying, "So what?" Something went wrong that hour and it might not have been entirely the fault of the students. There was lacking the stimulus that would maintain interest.

The moulding of the human mind—and I am naïve enough to consider *that* true education, self-determination to the contrary notwithstanding—might be compared to the blacksmith's art. Here our "metal" is forged to white heat in the forge of Interest, and then it is time for the shaping. As the smith patiently beats out a shape from his molten mass, have you ever observed the sparks that seem to fly back at him? It is this same sort of spark that we must look for as we shape our intellectual design. Do our finished products have in them the luster of forged and beaten steel or the brittleness of poured cast iron? Truth is not a windfall. We find it only after struggle and mental turmoil. It is not a catalogue of facts, but rather a relationship of facts that have come upon strong barriers of tradition, prejudice, and false standard. So to teach that truth, whatever it be, we must recognize and acknowledge the obstacles to be met, meet them at the run, and overcome them with the certainty that leaves no doubt. Those obstacles are what we have come to recognize as the objects of Challenge, and they are present, however hidden. Effective teaching seeks them out either by presenting them or encouraging their introduction—and then, and only then, drives them before it in the glory of its art.

Questioning. The proper use of questioning can be a teacher's most effective technique. At the beginning of a lecture or a new phase of a subject a question thrown out to the class when no adequate answer can reasonably be expected at that time may well

serve to whet appetites to seek the final answer. Answers to that question are forming and re-forming every minute. The question has been provocative of thought. The independent thinking that has been stimulated evidences the value of this technique.

The technique of questioning deserves comment here. Questions should be well stated. The question, "What about the atom bomb?" deserves but one answer: "Well, what about it?" Questions are for the benefit of the entire class and not merely one member of it. If Student Jones is called by name before the question is asked, the relieved sighs of his fellows will be heard. But if the question is directed to the entire class alertness will be sustained.

Assurance. It is unfortunate for the teacher to be uncertain of himself or of his subject, to permit his class to get out of hand, to be unduly embarrassed by difficult questions or problems, or to permit the class or some of it to argue excessively with him and his points of view. Unless the college authorities were wrong at the outset, and this is seldom the case, an instructor was engaged on the basis of his learning and scholarship in his chosen field. So when he steps before his class it has every reason to, and does, believe that he is the master of the room. If that attitude ever changes it is because of only one man and, in most cases, for only one reason. He has not the simple assurance of his own abilities. It would seem that the remedy for this is the simple physical and mental embodiment of one thought: "I've studied this subject for years, and this class begins it now. Intellectual respect must be commanded at all costs, even in retreat; not in the arrogance of a demagogue but in the humility of a scholar.

Teaching Environment. It is true that the administration usually sets the stage so far as equipment and surroundings are concerned. The size of the room, the plenitude of blackboards, and such items may or may not be adequate. But there are elements of the teaching environment that can be controlled by the teacher. When drowsiness appears to overtake the class, poor instruction is not necessarily the cause. It may be due to poor ventilation, inadequate lighting, noise in a corridor or in a nearby classroom. Any one of these detracts from the ideal that is so essential for sustained interest and absorption. These and similar distractions are controllable by the teacher.

The Personal Touch. When a class is recognized as a group of living, breathing persons and not as an impersonal audience, we can expect things to happen intellectually. Only then do we know that the subject is becoming an extension of ourselves in others who may take up the threads to weave a fuller pattern of thought. To know each member of the class is to meet each one's particular intellectual and emotional needs. To know the student is to understand the reason for his doubts, failures, and triumphs, and by patience and interest to join with him in the good results of our teaching. The activity page of the school paper and our lists of failing students may bear an unsuspected relation.

Obstacles to Effective Teaching

On the negative side are those quirks of habit and personality that have made Professor Sorglum a "delightful old character" and Professor Chumly a "bumbling blatherskite." These characteristics may well fit into the ivy pattern and liven the reminiscences of Alumni Day, but there hardly seems a place for them in effective college teaching. I shall enumerate and comment on some of these negative factors that are obstacles to effective teaching.

Appearance. Classes do not assemble for a spectacle, either from Esquire, the Hobo News—or Dickens. There is a golden mean that the continental universities, and some American ones, have used to cloak the sartorial differences, and oddities, of their masters—the academic gown. In the absence of such simplicity it would seem that the neatness and orderliness of the teacher would bespeak the orderliness and neatness of the lecture to be given. The attention of a class should be directed to the teacher and his pearls of wisdom and not to the garishness of his necktie; the misfit of his clothing, the color of his shirts, or the absence of his haircut. Some learned gentlemen seem to have the preconceived notion that such oddity adds to the fund of their wisdom. Those of us who have sat at their feet know that but for such distractions we might have absorbed and learned more. The human mind is so geared that it accepts one thing at a time. It is the teacher's obligation to his pupil that this one thing be what he says, without distraction by his appearance.

Vocal Expression. Some individuals are endowed with good speaking voices, but most people must cultivate theirs if they are to develop skill as lecturers. In this matter there are several aspects that must be considered: quality, volume, speed, pause, and enunciation.

There comes to my mind the lullaby voice that wears so heavily on the evening students and after-lunch classes. Some professors refer to these times of day as deadly times to teach. Perhaps, yes. But drowsiness comes so much easier in a drone. Surely the least of us has it within his larynx to develop those sounds that attract. We display them in moments of temper, joy, and of even mild extra-curricular interest. What becomes of them in the formality of a college classroom? The desirable quality of voice is simply those mixtures of sound put to words that raise the eyes of the listeners to the source: those same eyes that droop in response to a mumble.

Volume of voice is certainly understandably necessary. The easiest gauge of it is a casual glance at the rearmost rows of any class. If heads are turned and leaning forward, speak up!

Most lecturers presuppose adequate notetaking by the class. Consequently, the rapid-fire pace of the radio sports announcer has no place in education. On the other hand, if dictation is intended a set of mimeographed notes are very much in order. Somewhere between these two is the normal conversational rate of speaking that eliminates both confusion and irritation. Hand in hand with this maxim is the principle of accentuation by pause. Not a place to catch the breath, but rather the deliberate, planned break that brings with it interest and variety, and allows for intended intellectual seepage. The pause should be used to punctuate, not mutilate; it should come at important points as underlining, and it should be precise and deliberate, without the deadly "Er-rr" or "Ah." If we could only realize it, so often the pause in our speech creates the silence that awakens.

Then there is the matter of enunciation. I recall that I spent a goodly part of my first Chemistry classes puzzling over the extraordinary word "la-bor-a-tor-y." Certainly I knew its meaning. But wondering how any man could go to that extreme of pronunciation caused more important subject matter to pass me by.

There is no substitute for good speech—unless it be Silence. Classroom distractions are sufficiently plentiful without manufacturing more.

Mannerisms. The occasional tug at a necktie or the scratching of the chin serves a very utilitarian purpose. When either one or others of similar nature become habits there is a strong possibility that the class is waiting with bated breath for the next repetition, and wagers may even be made on the total for the class hour. I recall a certain professor who used the word "therefore" ninety-six times during one class meeting—I must confess, however, that I do not recall the topics of any of his lectures. Here again we face the distractions that impair the effectiveness of the subject being taught. The class can be interested in but one thing at one time, and that cannot be a side attraction.

Here we touch on things that for the most part are completely unknown to us. If we saw them in others we would perhaps breathe a sigh of relief that we were not guilty of them. But are we? Here is an assignment for our best friend, and in his absence I will attempt to mention just a few of the more common distracting mannerisms.

First, there is the space gazer. He will look anywhere but at his class; over their heads, up at the light shade, onto the floor, and out the window. This affliction is tantalizing to a class. The average class wants to be interested; they are alert to what is going on about them, even if it is not the subject matter of the class. To find, then, that the instructor has observed something of apparent attraction out the window, or on the floor at his feet, or in some other spot beyond the vision of the class makes the members of the class curious to the point that nothing matters for the moment except to share in the great vision. In such instances it would at least be sporting for the instructor to report on what he has observed, and then proceed.

For want of a better expression we might call the next distraction "doodling." It is that practice of being busy at something else while talking. It takes many forms, but one is as distracting as another. Some instructors lean to watch-winding, others to playing with a pen or pencil, still others to making curious little designs on paper as they talk. A class can put up with a goodly amount

of such industry, since all of us are afflicted with certain oddities, but there comes a time when it becomes downright annoying, as in the case where a plaything must be retrieved before the lecture can continue.

Then there is the contortionist. We have all seen at least one in our educational experience. In the enthusiasm of his subject he will go through the oddest maneuvers with his human frame. Some of us are born actors and such action can fit evenly into our subject and our speech, but for the majority it is a form of nervousness that should be corrected wherever possible. I refer particularly to such items as swaying to and fro, leaning against the edge of the desk, waving the hands and arms wildly in the air, frequent adjusting of clothing. Such actions cannot help but keep a class on edge. But the true objective is to make the subject itself keep the class on edge.

Arrogance. It is not a criminal offense to lack understanding of a subject, or even to be unprepared in a given assignment. True, the college administration places certain sanctions upon poor scholarship, and the instructor provides the source material for its decisions. But it is most unfortunate that there are instructors who consider it an affront to their person that they have been questioned, or not understood, or have discovered an inadequate mind in their midst. Learning is not a contest of wits to be played with slurs and snide remarks. It is, rather, the patient leading of hungry minds from fact to fact and truth to truth. There is no place in the picture for studied rudeness, embarrassment, or undue reprimand. It should be assumed as a basic principle that the students were accepted by the institution with reasonable regard for their intellectual abilities, and that they come to the class with a normal desire to learn. To hinder this desire by fear and abuse is certainly no credit to the high art of teaching. By a display of magisterial courtesy that desire can readily be magnified. The instructor has devoted years to the mastery of the principles he is explaining. If he shows the same patience to his class as he showed in developing his own scholarship, he may be sowing the seeds of scholarship that he himself has reaped.

It seems clear to those who have given attention to the improvement of teaching on the college level that research, publication,

and general excellence of scholarship are the principal facets of professional advancement. The missing link, however, is the one upon which our entire system of higher education depends: that "the University by its very name professes to teach universal knowledge." If we lose sight of the concept of the word *teach* we might well confess that our scholars could band together in their own select groups and improve their collective minds. If, on the other hand, we respect the concept we must pay it the homage it is due. Herein we have attempted to illustrate in rough form a number of the positive and negative factors that leaven effective teaching. It has not been our purpose to criticize college teaching except to throw a small beam of light upon hidden pitfalls. If those pitfalls seem to have been exaggerated, or their reference sharp, it is only because their effects have been keenly felt by many silent listeners in their quest for the fine truths of life and their own intellectual development.

THE IMPROVEMENT OF EXAMINATIONS

By L. L. THURSTONE

The University of Chicago

The purpose of an examination is to appraise the effects of instruction and to certify students as to their degree of mastery or competence in a specified subject or field. All teachers are concerned with examinations, not only at the termination of a course of instruction but also for the daily or weekly or monthly tests to review progress in a course. To prepare tests is a chore that most instructors dislike, and properly so, because their principal interest is usually in students and in subject matter rather than in tests and grades.

The present proposal concerns the publication of aids for teachers in preparing the quizzes and examinations which they are all expected to conduct during a course and at the termination of each course.

The large examinations, such as the New York State Regents and the College Board examinations and the comprehensive examinations in some of the colleges, are prepared by special staffs of examiners who prepare the examination material, print the tests, and grade the papers. We are not here concerned with these large undertakings which are supported by special funds and special staffs. We are concerned primarily with the important problem of improving the school tests that are conducted in every classroom in the high schools and in the colleges. These tests are prepared by the individual instructors and most of the papers are graded by the instructors. They know very little about the improved examination methods and they have little interest in studying them.

Most of the content of courses in the high schools and in the colleges can be adequately covered by the objective examination methods. The disadvantage is that these examinations require much time and work to prepare. The advantages are improved

incisiveness in covering the material, much higher reliability and validity in grading, and speed of grading in comparison with the essay tests which must still be used for some subjects. Most teachers probably think of the objective test methods in terms of the true-false question type as if that were the only objective test form available. They do not know how to write objective examinations and they have little interest in spending the time to prepare objective tests even if they do know how to write them. They can usually appreciate the objective test forms when these are supplied.

To prepare complete examinations in the objective form for use in the schools does not answer the need. If complete examinations are supplied, the examinations tend to freeze the content as well as the standards. The standards of a school should be adjusted to its clientele. The standards should not be set by an outside agency unless national standards of certification are at stake. Every school should be free to set its own standards to serve the community and its students. Further, the content in a course may vary legitimately. A beginning course in chemistry should not necessarily be uniform over the whole country. The same is true for many other subjects. We need a good deal of freedom to encourage innovations in teaching.

The present proposal is to prepare a set of manuals for each high school or elementary college subject. The manuals should contain examination questions arranged according to the conventional chapter headings in the current texts. For example, a high-school teacher of physics has just completed a chapter on sound. He turns to a manual of examination questions in physics. One section of that manual contains several hundred objective questions on sound. He selects some questions which seem to be appropriate as to content and level of difficulty for his students. He checks those to be used in a quiz. He either copies them on the blackboard or he has them mimeographed for his class. To prepare such an examination from a manual would require very little time, whereas he would spend days in preparing the same list of objective questions even if he were expert in the preparation of examinations. Experts in this field do not write objective examinations in a hurry.

The instructor might use the test ideas of the manual without copying the exact form. The manual should contain so many items that he could write examinations in his subject indefinitely without undue repetition. There would be no harm if students should get hold of the manual. The students would probably discover that it is easier to learn the subject from the textbook than by studying thousands of examination questions. If they should learn the answers to all the questions in the manual, they would surely know the subject. It would be more trouble for them than to read the text. It might be a good plan to put a copy of each manual in the school library.

The preparation of an examination manual or a set of manuals for each subject could be a cooperative undertaking. Teachers should be encouraged to supply examination questions and problems. These should be edited and assembled by one or two experienced teachers with the assistance of an advisory committee. The examination items accepted for the manuals could be identified by the initials of the contributors. The manuals could be produced by offset printing.

Because of the cost of preparing examinations in the objective form, it is not an uncommon practice to number and identify each copy of every examination and to keep it secret so that it can be used again and again. The result is that every fraternity house will attempt to keep copies of examinations for student reference. A much better practice is to announce that every examination becomes public property as soon as it has been given. Students should be allowed to keep copies of the examinations that they have taken if they care to study and discuss the questions with their friends even after the examination has been taken. Students should be able to obtain copies of past examinations for a small fee while they are preparing for their own examinations. This is a problem that must be solved by each college or school. It can be solved in the educationally desirable way if the preparation of new examinations is not so expensive in time and labor that it becomes prohibitive to prepare fresh examinations for every new class.

A little calculation about the value of examination manuals that could be distributed to high schools and colleges seems to indicate that the kind of project here described would easily be more than

self-supporting. The project could be financed in a sound manner so that an educational activity of this kind would not be dependent on annual foundation grants. The project would be facilitated by a grant for its first year but after that it should be self-supporting by the value of its services to teachers and schools.

It would be advantageous for teachers to become familiar with improved examination methods. If they were supplied with examination manuals of the kind here described, they would find them immediately useful and time-saving. Their examinations would be much improved and they would become familiar with the versatility of the objective methods. They would begin to contribute test ideas themselves which could be made generally available in periodic new issues of the manuals. Teachers at all levels would be encouraged to participate in the work of preparing and evaluating examinations as a part of their professional work. Current practice is to keep teachers largely dependent on the examinations issued periodically by central boards of test experts or by authors who make their examination material available commercially.

SOCRATES ON THE SALARY QUESTION

By WILLIAM PEIRCE RANDEL

Florida State University

Never am I so shaken to the roots of my being as when I discuss burning questions of the day with my old friend S Our colloquies, scattered through the years, have again and again come to an abrupt close when, in indignation, I have simply stalked away in the middle of one of his sentences. Yet my rage subsides, in time, and I always go back, armed with new arguments and statistics, only to suffer another ignominious defeat. What most disturbs me is that his prophecies, absurd as they seem when he issues them, have an uncanny way of coming true. He foresaw the income tax, for instance, at a time when no right-thinking person would even talk about it. He predicted the New Deal a decade before it burst upon us. More recently he has been speaking of a rapid socialization in this country, in a way that makes me shudder with apprehension and wake in the night in a cold sweat.

Our latest conversation touched upon matters closely related to my very life blood, and I am tempted to record it as faithfully as I can in the hope that someone better equipped than I will be able to refute his argument. Needless to say, the proposal troubled me profoundly; even the act of committing it to paper agitates the normal serenity of my mind. I fervently hope that for once his radical ideas are without foundation.

For convenience, I shall call my friend Socrates, a name not too dissimilar from his own and reminiscent of a character to be found in certain ancient dialogues almost as disquieting to me as my friend's propositions. In choosing the term "Ego" to represent me, I ask the forbearance of classicists for joining a Latinism with a Greek proper name.

.

Ego: I say, is anybody there?

SOCRATES: Here I am, old chap—around on the screened porch. Mind the broken step; the late frost cracked it. . . . Here, take this chair. You look done up.

EGO: I do feel winded. Your hill gets steeper every year.

SOCRATES: Your metaphysics improves with age, I'm glad to see. Now if your personal habits would also improve, I'd be very happy. You wouldn't want one of these cigars? Or a highball? I thought not. Ah, me, I've often envied you ascetics, keeping your ivory towers so spotless.

EGO: Now, Socrates, you promised never to refer to ivory towers again.

SOCRATES: I'm sorry; I forgot.

EGO: But since you've brought the subject up, I may as well say that the ivory's wearing thin.

SOCRATES: So? When did you start noticing it?

EGO: Since the war began. Do you know, they even made me teach a class of Navy cadets? I had to put off my research for eighteen months.

SOCRATES: But the tower itself could remain intact?

EGO: Perhaps; I've tried to think so. But the new crop of instructors—they're a sorry lot. Not up to the old standards. We've been having the very devil of a time finding good men.

SOCRATES: What about good women?

EGO: Women in college work? You can't be serious.

SOCRATES: Hmm.

EGO: The armed forces drained off most of our best instructors, and now that the war's over they just aren't coming back. We've held their jobs for them, but they're finding better-paid positions in government and industry. We're getting only the skimmed milk. And with increasing enrollments, we need more instructors than ever.

SOCRATES: And they're in hiding. What have you done to rout them out?

EGO: Well, we've raised the starting salary, from \$1800 to \$2100. But good men with the qualifications we expect can get \$3500 in big concerns. One fellow who taught for us a year before he was drafted came back last year and took a position at \$4800. Think of it—forty-eight hundred dollars!

SOCRATES: By the way, were other salaries raised?

EGO: Oh, yes. It wouldn't do to raise only one class; it would cause grumbling. Yes, we got the floor for assistant and associate professors changed to \$2700 and \$4000, respectively—that's \$300 higher in each case. And full professors now start at \$5000 instead of \$4500.

SOCRATES: That must have pleased everybody.

EGO: Believe me, it did. With all these strikes and inflated prices, to say nothing of income taxes, I for one certainly needed that extra \$500.

SOCRATES: Can the new instructors buy food at the old prices?

EGO: Why no; of course not.

SOCRATES: Does the college supply them with living quarters?

EGO: How could it? There just aren't any available places. Besides, the college can't go into business.

SOCRATES: I see. . . . How's your wife?

EGO: About the same. She's president of the A. A. U. W. this year.

SOCRATES: That's fine—a good organization. And your sons: are they both back?

EGO: John's back, with his old law firm. But Harry's staying in a while; he's a major now, and he wants to wait until things get settled.

SOCRATES: And your daughter—still in Hawaii?

EGO: Yes. She tried to persuade us to visit her this summer. Her husband's practice is excellent.

SOCRATES: Your house must seem empty with the children all gone.

EGO: It does. We're thinking of selling it. We've been offered \$18,000 for it—just three times what it cost us twenty years ago.

SOCRATES: I don't suppose you've considered renting out rooms.

EGO: Heaven forbid! My wife's nerves wouldn't stand it.

SOCRATES: Tell me, old chap, would you like to be starting in again, this fall, as an instructor?

EGO: I would not.

SOCRATES: Yet you want other human beings to start in as

instructors. You want them to struggle with an acute housing shortage, and high food prices, and the problem of raising a family.

EGO: I didn't say that.

SOCRATES: No, not those exact words. But you've implied that good young men are at fault for not choosing to do these things.

EGO: Not at fault. I'm just apprehensive about finding the right men.

SOCRATES: It's much the same. Let's not quarrel over words. But tell me this: you had your children soon after you were married, didn't you?

EGO: Why, yes; people should. Young parents are best; it's in the best tradition.

SOCRATES: And as one result, your three are all married and on their own—no longer costing you anything.

EGO: That's right. As a matter of fact, the two boys are paying off the loans I made to get them started.

SOCRATES: Good for them. Now you've said you wouldn't like to be starting all over again, as an instructor.

EGO: Yes.

SOCRATES: But if you had to, would you want your family right away?

EGO: On \$2100? I doubt it very much.

SOCRATES: Then when would you start your family?

EGO: I don't know. When I got promoted, I suppose.

SOCRATES: Would that be soon?

EGO: I'm afraid not. You see, the upper ranks are crowded; most of the associate and full professors are in their forties and fifties. We simply can't promote our younger men, much as we'd like to—the best ones, I mean. We have to let them go after six years, before they earn permanent tenure.

SOCRATES: I see. Do they get any boosts in salary?

EGO: Yes, we can push them up to the ceiling of \$2700, now that the assistant professors start at that.

SOCRATES: Still well under what business pays. If that is true, and if you were starting again, what about your family? Would you give up the idea of having children?

EGO: No, I can't imagine that.

SOCRATES: Then what alternative is there?

EGO: I suppose I wouldn't choose to teach.

SOCRATES: A very sound decision. But I'm troubled about some things you've said. These men that fill the upper ranks—are they the best men in the department?

EGO: Yes and no. Some are, some aren't. Jones and Brown are top-notch, but Smith and White are drones—just plain drones, and no two ways about it. I shouldn't say so, for reasons of professional ethics, but I know such things never go beyond you. The rest of the department, I should say, range between the two extremes.

SOCRATES: You're being modest. But how do you account for the drones getting as far along as they do?

EGO: They were brilliant instructors, the exceptions who got promoted. But then they just stopped working; or rather they did only enough to get by, and hung on.

SOCRATES: And earned further promotions in time?

EGO: Oh, yes, we have fairly regular rules for advancement.

SOCRATES: Except for instructors.

EGO: We have to try them out. We visit their classes, and see how much they publish. It doesn't pay to make too quick a decision.

SOCRATES: But some turn into drones despite your efforts. Do you visit other classes?

EGO: Oh, no; that would violate professional ethics.

SOCRATES: Which classes are the larger, those of instructors or those of the higher ranks?

EGO: There are some exceptions, like Brown's famous lecture course, but the freshman classes, always taught by instructors, are far and away the largest.

SOCRATES: The older men, I assume, make up for the difference in class size by taking more classes.

EGO: How naïve you sometimes are! Did you really think so? No, the teaching load always goes down as a man climbs the ladder. Instructors have twelve or fifteen hours a week, assistant and associate professors nine, and full professors six.

SOCRATES: Then the men in higher ranks must have harder courses.

EGO: More advanced courses, I'd say—sometimes referred to as the "gravy courses."

SOCRATES: And you just ladle it out?

EGO: One pun an evening. No more, please.

SOCRATES: Forgive me. It seems, from what you've told me, that it's a pretty fine thing to survive long enough to become a full professor.

EGO: It's a good life; I wouldn't want to exchange it for anything else.

SOCRATES: Such a good life, in fact, that a man might be willing to pay for it rather than be paid.

EGO: I wouldn't say that.

SOCRATES: Nor would I seriously suggest it. But it strikes me that society is getting its money's worth in inverse proportion to faculty rank.

EGO: How so?

SOCRATES: You've said that instructors are paid the least, have the largest classes, and the greatest number of classes. Full professors are paid the most, have the fewest classes, and the smallest. You've also said that while certain full professors are excellent, others are fair and some downright bad. How can you defend a situation in which, on the average, the men doing the measurable most for society are paid the least, while some who do almost nothing—as little as possible—are paid the most?

EGO: I can't defend it; it's just the traditional thing.

SOCRATES: It's also the best tradition, as you said before, to have one's family early. Yet this has become almost impossible under the present arrangement.

EGO: You're confusing me.

SOCRATES: No, I'm not; you're confusing yourself, and you know it. I'm sure I've already given you my views on traditions. They can be very good or very harmful. From all you've said tonight I can only conclude that your faculty tradition is very bad. Perhaps the arrangement was good once, but it obviously isn't now. I think it's high time to change it radically.

EGO: I might have known you'd use that word eventually.

SOCRATES: I use it advisedly. You must get at the very root of the matter. You can't attract the best young men, the kind

you insist you should have, by a piddling increase in the starting salary. You—and of course I don't mean you personally, but the college administration and the regents—you've simply got to tackle this problem realistically. If you don't, who will? And if you don't, what's to become of higher education? Who likes the prospect of steadily deteriorating college faculties? You talk of drones; better a few drones than entire departments of incompetents.

EGO: Come, now, it's not that bad.

SOCRATES: Not yet, perhaps, but it may soon be.

EGO: And what do you suggest?

SOCRATES: There's only one way out, as I see it. You've got to turn the pyramid upside down. Start your instructors at the top salaries, keep them there ten years while they're building their homes, starting their families, and in general getting established. Then every year after the tenth pare off a hundred dollars until you reach whatever final floor is agreed on; if it's \$3500, a man will get there after thirty-five years of teaching. By then he will presumably have the delightful—the idyllic existence that you say full professors enjoy, and society will be repaid in a far more equitable proportion than now. And the total cost of any given department will be less, in the long run. How can anyone challenge this plan?

EGO: But don't you see, Socrates, that only the drones would stay? Really good men would get out as soon as the paring began.

SOCRATES: I don't think so. It's true that the drones would stay and earn less every year. The good men, on the other hand, would do just what they're doing now: they'd write textbooks and give lectures, they'd serve as consultants for big concerns, and have radio programs, and conduct government surveys—there's no end of possibilities. The difference would be that the college administration would step in and serve as agent, directing and promoting these activities, and incidentally collecting a small fee for its pains. The faculty member and the administration would in effect become partners in projects advantageous to both and to the reputation of the college. Nobody would be forced to do any of these extras, but the administration would see to it that opportunities were made available for all.

EGO: You overwhelm me.

SOCRATES: But you see how logical it is. You yourself have complained, on more than one occasion, about certain of your colleagues whose outside incomes were larger than their salaries, despite the regulations now in force against off-campus work. This plan would equalize the chances and set some reasonable limits on individual benefits. With one stroke the hypocrisy and the inequities would be removed. With a well-organized campaign even your monograph might have succeeded.

EGO: That's hitting below the belt.

SOCRATES: I didn't mean to; but you'll agree that one man on his own has less chance to get a book across than if he has strong backing. Those were your own words, spoken a dozen years ago. You forget how my memory works.

EGO: You're right. But I'm afraid no such plan as the one you've outlined will ever be put into effect.

SOCRATES: Are you sure you aren't afraid it might?

.
I left him at that point, for it was getting late. I've tried to get his peculiar ideas out of my head, but it's no use. What I really fear, at the moment, is that I'll get up at the first faculty meeting next month and wreck a lifetime reputation for sanity by proposing my friend's plan for my college.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS' SALARY SCHEDULES

By HENRY G. BADGER

United States Office of Education

The great wave of discussion of public school teachers' salary schedules has served to focus attention on that problem. Not so spectacular as this problem, however, but nonetheless far-reaching in its own field, is the problem of salaries and salary schedules in institutions of higher education.

Up to a few years ago a salary schedule was a rare thing in an institution of collegiate grade. Recent years, however, have seen the number of these schedules increase so that they are now an accepted fact in almost every state and every type of institution.

In a paper published in the Autumn, 1947 issue of this *Bulletin*,¹ there was presented certain material on regulations governing college teachers' salaries. The present paper constitutes a further analysis of the data there referred to as having been collected for the joint use of the United States Office of Education and the American Association of University Professors.² The attempt here will be to analyze the schedules from the point of view of their construction and to determine such common characteristics as may exist among them.

In appraising the data here presented and any conclusions herein stated, certain facts should be kept in mind:

First, there is no assurance that the data available for study include all the salary schedules in colleges and universities over the country. There are approximately 1750 of these institutions in the United States. Of this number approximately 675, just under 40 per cent, furnished some sort of data for the present study. Only

¹ Henry G. Badger, "Administrative Policies Governing the Salaries of College Teachers," in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors, Vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 443-463.

² For the tabulations contained in this paper, I am indebted to Adele C. Durkin, of the office staff of the American Association of University Professors.

372 of these institutions supplied schedules which were sufficiently detailed to warrant analysis. This number is approximately 55 per cent of the number of replies received, but represents only about 21 per cent of the total number of institutions in the country. Thus, it is impossible to say that all institutions having salary schedules furnished copies of them to the Office of Education. It is likewise obviously unwise to make any statement as to the representativeness or unrepresentativeness of the schedules available for study.

It is just as unsafe to make any comment as to the percentage of good or poor schedules included in the present inquiry. This is owing to the fact just cited, and to the additional fact that there appears to be at present no consensus as to what constitutes a good salary schedule.

Again, the salary data here used are for 1946-47. Other studies made on a fragmentary basis indicate that the general level of college salaries for 1948-49 will be approximately 22 per cent above that for 1946-47. Accordingly any figures dealing with the actual salary situation in 1946-47 should be multiplied by 1.22 to arrive at corresponding figures for 1948-49.

Finally, it should be clearly understood that although the data are public property and the facts speak for themselves, any conclusions based on these facts are those of the present writer, who alone must accept responsibility for these conclusions.

The present data therefore summarize the characteristics of as many schedules as are available and indicate the commonest practices. No categorical pronouncement can be made as to the best practices. It is hoped, however, that a compilation and summarization of the facts will contribute toward an intelligent appraisal of these facts.

Types of Salary Schedules

Among the 372 schedules included in the present analysis, no fewer than 36 different types emerge. Of these, 245, or nearly two-thirds, fall into three main types: the overlapping, the nonoverlapping, and the discontinuous. Since these types of schedules were defined in the paper previously referred to,¹ the definitions need not be repeated here.

¹ Henry G. Badger, *op. cit.*, pp. 454-455.

The overlapping schedule is reported by 157 institutions, or 42.2 per cent of the entire group. Of these, 42 are privately controlled colleges of liberal arts, 39 are publicly controlled teachers colleges, and 28 are junior colleges under public control. This type is favored by many educators.

The nonoverlapping type of schedule is found in 32 institutions, 8.6 per cent of the total group.

The discontinuous type of schedule occurs in 56 institutions, 15.0 per cent of the total group.

Two other types not shown separately in the tabulation are worthy of passing mention: A somewhat rudimentary form of schedule is that in which there is a minimum salary but no maximum salary for each rank. Of the 23 institutions reporting this type of schedule, 17 are under private control; 15 of the 17 are colleges of liberal arts.

A flat salary for each rank, with no provision for increments, is

TABLE 1—SALARY SCHEDULES IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1946-47

Type of Institution	Type of Schedule				
	Overlapping	Nonoverlapping	Discontinuous	Miscellaneous	Total
Publicly Controlled:					
Universities.....	13	2	7	8	30
Colleges.....	8	..	3	2	13
Professional Schools....	5	..	4	6	15
Teachers Colleges.....	39	3	2	25	69
Junior Colleges.....	28	..	1	2	31
Total.....	93	5	17	43	158
Privately Controlled:					
Universities.....	9	2	2	7	20
Colleges.....	42	16	31	51	140
Professional Schools....	4	7	6	16	33
Teachers Colleges.....	1	1	..	1	3
Junior Colleges.....	8	1	..	9	18
Total.....	64	27	39	84	214
All Institutions, Public and Private:					
Universities.....	22	4	9	15	50
Colleges.....	50	16	34	53	153
Professional Schools....	9	7	10	22	48
Teachers Colleges.....	40	4	2	26	72
Junior Colleges.....	36	1	1	11	49
Grand Total.....	157	32	56	127	372

provided in nine institutions, all of them under private control.

The remaining 95 schedules fall into 31 types, most of them combinations of two or more of the types just described.

Provision for Increments

It appears that three out of every eight institutions having salary schedules make provision for increments in at least somewhat definite terms. Of the 372 institutions considered, 143, or 38.4 per cent, have some provision of this type. Of the 143 institutions, 114 are under public control and 29 under the control of nonpublic organizations. Just 100 of the institutions provide for automatic increments, 78 of them under public and 22 under private control. Semi-automatic increments, or increments which are practically but not definitely set forth as automatic, are provided at 36 public and seven private institutions.

Of the entire group of 143 institutions providing for salary increments of some sort, 40 are junior colleges under public control and seven are privately controlled institutions of this level. It appears that increments are automatic or quasi-automatic in this entire group of 47 junior colleges. Since junior college salary schedules are as a rule so different in general make-up from those of degree-granting institutions, the data used from this point on refer to degree-granting institutions exclusively except where specific reference is made to junior colleges.

It appears that annual increments, in addition to being common in junior colleges, are provided in nearly ten times as many degree-granting institutions as provide for biennial increments. Those on other frequency cycles (18 months, etc.) are so rare as to warrant only passing mention.

While data have not been assembled to prove the point conclusively, there is reason to believe that the institutions allowing the greatest number of increments make these increments smaller in amount than are allowed in institutions where fewer increments are provided for.

The number of annual increments varies more or less with the rank of the teacher. Thus, for professors the number of increments ranges from three to 24; for associate professors, from three to 22; for assistant professors, from three to 20; and for instructors, from

TABLE 2—SALARY INCREMENTS FOR TEACHING STAFF IN 96 DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1946-47*

	Publicly Controlled	Privately Controlled	Total
Increments provided:			
Automatic.....	38	15	53
Not automatic, but usual	36	7	43
Total.....	74	22	96
ANNUAL INCREMENTS			
Number of Increments:			
Professors†.....	46	6	52
Maximum.....	14	24	24
Median.....	6.1	*	5.9
Minimum.....	4	3	3
Associate Professors....	43	8	51
Maximum.....	14	22	22
Median.....	6.1	*	5.3
Minimum.....	4	3	3
Assistant Professors....	46	7	53
Maximum.....	15	20	20
Median.....	6.1	*	5.1
Minimum.....	3	3	3
Instructors.....	44	6	50
Maximum.....	15	4	15
Median.....	4.9	*	4.7
Minimum.....	1	2	1
Amount of Increments:			
Professors.....	50	14	64
Maximum.....	\$325	\$250	\$325
Median.....	125	118	123
Minimum.....	100	50	50
Associate Professors....	49	14	63
Maximum.....	\$250	\$250	\$250
Median.....	125	125	125
Minimum.....	100	50	50
Assistant Professors....	51	13	64
Maximum.....	\$225	\$250	\$250
Median.....	129	163	138
Minimum.....	100	50	50
Instructors.....	48	11	59
Maximum.....	\$225	\$200	\$225
Median.....	135	123	131
Minimum.....	100	25	25
BIENNIAL INCREMENTS			
Number of Increments:			
Professors.....	4	2	6
Maximum.....	7	4	7
Minimum.....	2	3	2
Associate Professors....	4	2	6
Maximum.....	7	4	7
Minimum.....	2	3	2
Assistant Professors....	4	2	6
Maximum.....	9	4	9
Minimum.....	2	3	2

TABLE 2—(Continued)

	Publicly Controlled	Privately Controlled	Total
Instructors.....	4	1	5
Maximum.....	6	4	6
Minimum.....	3	4	3
Amount of Increments:			
Professors.....	4	4	8
Maximum.....	\$600	\$500	\$600
Minimum.....	100	100	100
Associate Professors....	4	4	8
Maximum.....	\$300	\$500	\$500
Minimum.....	100	100	100
Assistant Professors....	4	4	8
Maximum.....	\$300	\$500	\$500
Minimum.....	100	100	100
Instructors.....	3	4	7
Maximum.....	\$150	\$250	\$250
Minimum.....	100	100	100

* Not including 40 publicly controlled and 7 privately controlled junior colleges which provide for annual, automatic increments (see text).

† Figures indicate number of institutions reporting.

one to 15. Median numbers are: for professors, 5.9; for associate professors, 5.3; for assistant professors, 5.1; and for instructors, 4.7.

There is some indication that the number of increments varies with control of institution, although evidence on this point is inconclusive due to the small number of privately controlled institutions furnishing data. The range of increments for publicly controlled institutions is from one to 15, the entire range occurring in the instructors' schedules; for privately controlled institutions this range is from two for instructors to 24 for professors.

There is considerable spread in the amount of annual increments provided for the different ranks. For professors this amount ranges from \$50 to \$325; for associate professors and assistant professors, from \$50 to \$250; and for instructors, from \$25 to \$225. The median amounts of increments are, however, quite close together: for professors, \$123; for associate professors, \$125; for assistant professors, \$138; and for instructors, \$131.

Comparative data on relation of amount of increment to control of institution are again inconclusive, but there is evident a range from \$100 to \$325 among publicly controlled institutions, as com-

pared with one from \$25 to \$250 among those under private control.

Data on biennial increments are quite meager. They indicate, however, that in general the biennial increment is likely to be larger in amount than that provided on an annual basis.

Salary Schedules

A study of salary schedules in institutions attended predominantly by Negroes¹ speaks of a differential of from 10 to 15 per cent between salary schedules in institutions of higher education attended predominantly by Negroes and those in institutions attended by white persons. Since the compilation of schedules carried in the study published in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors for the Autumn of 1947² included institutions of both types, it has seemed advisable at this time to assemble data on the white institutions as a group. These data are presented in Table 3.

This table may be compared with Tables 3 and 4 in the study already referred to in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors, differences in medians and other figures being due in part to the exclusion of institutions attended predominantly by Negroes and in part to the inclusion of certain other institutions attended by white persons which could not be included in the earlier tables.

It may not be amiss to emphasize the fact that the data summarized in this table are for 1946-47. To obtain an idea of the general salary level for 1948-49, multiply these figures by 1.22. Thus the median salaries scheduled for instructors in publicly controlled universities would change from a median minimum of \$2092 to \$2552 and a median maximum from \$3250 to \$3965. In like manner median salary ranges for the other ranks are: For assistant professors \$3538 to \$5124; for associate professors \$4291 to \$6222 and for professors \$5168 to \$7808. Similar calcula-

¹ Henry G. Badger, "Salary Trends and Policies," in *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Association of Business Officers in Schools for Negroes*, 1947, pp. 68-69.

² Henry G. Badger, "Administrative Policies Governing the Salaries of College Teachers," *op. cit.*, p. 445.

tions can, of course, be made for any other set of figures in the table.

TABLE 3—RANGE OF ANNUAL SALARIES SCHEDULED IN 315 DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, ATTENDED BY WHITE PERSONS, 1946-47

	Instructor		Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Professor	
	Mini-mum	Maxi-mum	Mini-mum	Maxi-mum	Mini-mum	Maxi-mum	Mini-mum	Maxi-mum
Publicly Controlled Institutions								
Universities.....	33	28	32	26	31	26	31	26
Highest.....	\$3600	\$4800	\$3900	\$6500	\$4800	\$8000	\$6000	\$12,000
Median.....	2092	3250	2900	4200	3517	5100	4236	6400
Lowest.....	1500	2100	2000	2500	2300	3700	3000	3600
Arts and Science Colleges...	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
Highest.....	\$3000	\$3600	\$3780	\$4800	\$4380	\$6000	\$4980	\$7000
Median.....	2808	3517	3108	4310	3710	4910	4230	6108
Lowest.....	1500	2025	2200	2500	2600	3000	3100	3900
Professional and Technical Schools.....	16	16	16	16	14	14	15	15
Highest.....	\$4149	\$4275	\$4500	\$5500	\$5000	\$5905	\$6500	\$7500
Median.....	2267	3100	2880	3950	3800	4600	4816	6025
Lowest.....	1500	2200	2000	2800	2500	3400	3300	4000
Teachers Colleges.....	57	57	53	53	49	49	54	54
Highest.....	\$3000	\$4050	\$3600	\$4500	\$4400	\$5220	\$5200	\$6240
Median.....	2405	3150	3013	3625	3558	4317	3778	4750
Lowest.....	1500	2200	1800	2700	2200	3000	2400	3600
Privately Controlled Institutions								
Universities.....	22	19	22	19	17	16	18	12
Highest.....	\$3000	\$3600	\$3600	\$5100	\$5000	\$6000	\$7500	\$12,000
Median.....	2414	3092	3060	3950	3550	4500	4300	6033
Lowest.....	1800	2600	2400	3200	2700	3780	3600	4320
Colleges.....	129	121	136	123	134	120	141	116
Highest.....	\$2800	\$3400	\$3600	\$4700	\$5000	\$6000	\$7500	\$9000
Median.....	1899	2575	2417	3053	2889	3500	3339	4032
Lowest.....	1100	1400	1400	1600	1600	1800	1800	1980
Professional and Technical Schools.....	30	31	32	31	29	29	39	39
Highest.....	\$3000	\$4000	\$4000	\$5000	\$5725	\$7250	\$9500	\$15,000
Median.....	2438	3045	3200	4031	4007	5025	4517	6013
Lowest.....	1500	2400	1700	2400	2500	3200	2700	3000
Teachers Colleges*
Medians for all publicly controlled institutions.....	\$2270	\$3233	\$3007	\$3850	\$3595	\$4380	\$4059	\$5200
Medians for all privately controlled institutions.....	2043	2738	2621	3269	3092	3760	3642	4539
Medians for all institutions	2092	2868	2770	3527	3306	4070	3905	4831

* Data on privately controlled teachers colleges and normal schools not received in sufficient amount to justify tabulation.

Relation of Salary to Rank

Table 4 shows in percentage form the relation which exists between the scheduled salaries of (1) instructors and the ranks above them, and (2) professors and the ranks below them. This table shows, for example, that the common rule of thumb that a professor should receive approximately twice as much salary as an instructor is not followed implicitly in the different types of institutions. In the universities under public control, this rule is observed quite closely, the median minimum salary for professors being 202.5 per cent and the median maximum salary 196.9 per cent, respectively, of the corresponding salaries for instructors. In other types of institutions, however, this percentage relation fluctuates from a low of 150.6 per cent in publicly controlled colleges of liberal arts and sciences to a high of 212.4 per cent in publicly controlled professional and technical schools.

In like manner at universities under public control, the median minimum salary of an instructor is 49.4 per cent of that of a professor.

It may be noted that the relation between these salaries in the entire group of institutions, as shown in the last line of the table, does not check with the relation for the two types by con-

TABLE 4—INDEX NUMBERS OF MEDIAN MINIMUM SALARIES AS SCHEDULED IN 315 DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1946-1947*

Part I—Instructor = 100.0

	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Publicly Controlled:				
Universities.....	100.0	138.6	168.1	202.5
Colleges.....	100.0	110.0	132.1	150.6
Professional and Technical Schools.....	100.0	127.0	172.0	212.4
Teachers Colleges.....	100.0	125.2	147.9	157.0
Privately Controlled:				
Universities.....	100.0	126.7	147.0	178.1
Colleges.....	100.0	127.2	152.1	176.8
Professional and Technical Schools.....	100.0	135.7	164.3	185.2
Teachers Colleges.....
Total Publicly Controlled Institutions.....	100.0	132.4	158.3	178.8
Total Privately Controlled Institutions.....	100.0	128.2	151.2	178.2
Grand Total.....	100.0	132.4	158.0	186.6

Part II—Professor = 100.0

	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Publicly Controlled:				
Universities.....	49.4	68.5	83.0	100.0
Colleges.....	66.4	73.5	87.7	100.0
Professional and Technical Schools.....	47.1	59.8	78.9	100.0
Teachers Colleges.....	63.7	79.8	94.2	100.0
Privately Controlled:				
Universities.....	56.1	71.2	82.6	100.0
Colleges.....	56.9	72.4	86.5	100.0
Professional and Technical Schools.....	54.0	70.8	88.7	100.0
Teachers Colleges.....
Total Publicly Controlled Institutions.....	55.9	74.1	88.6	100.0
Total Privately Controlled Institutions.....	56.1	72.0	84.9	100.0
Grand Total.....	53.6	70.9	84.7	100.0

* Attended by white persons.

trol. This is probably due to the fact that the groups of institutions studied are not identical from rank to rank. That is, the list of institutions included in that section of the table dealing with one rank might be longer or shorter than the list concerned with another rank.

Promotion Within a Rank

The spread between median minimum and median maximum salaries for the different ranks and in the different types of institutions is shown in Table 5. Here it would appear that the opportunities for promotion within a rank are best in the universities under public control. In these institutions an instructor may be promoted to an average of 155.3 per cent of his minimum salary, an assistant professor to 144.8 per cent, an associate professor to 145.0 per cent, and a professor to 151.1 per cent; in other words, a teacher in any of the commoner ranks of teachers in public universities can reasonably look forward to a maximum salary half again as large as his minimum salary, without change of rank.

Least opportunities for promotion within a rank, judging from this table, appear to be for:

- Instructors in publicly controlled colleges of arts and sciences;
- Assistant professors in publicly controlled teachers colleges;

Associate professors in publicly controlled colleges of arts and sciences, closely followed by privately controlled colleges of arts and sciences; and

Professors in privately controlled colleges of arts and sciences.

TABLE 5—PERCENTAGE RELATION, MEDIAN MAXIMUM INSTRUCTIONAL SALARIES TO MEDIAN MINIMUM SALARIES AS SCHEDULED IN 315 DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1946-47

	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Publicly Controlled:				
Universities.....	155.3	144.8	145.0	151.1
Colleges.....	125.2	138.6	105.3	144.3
Professional and Technical Schools.....	136.7	137.1	121.0	125.1
Teachers Colleges.....	130.9	120.3	121.3	125.7
Privately Controlled:				
Universities.....	128.0	129.0	126.7	140.3
Colleges.....	135.5	126.3	121.1	120.4
Professional and Technical Schools.....	128.9	125.9	125.4	133.0
Teachers Colleges.....
Total Publicly Controlled Institutions.....	142.4	128.0	121.8	128.1
Total Privately Controlled Institutions.....	134.0	124.7	121.6	124.6
Grand Total.....	137.1	127.3	123.1	123.7

The Up-or-out Policy

Occasional reference is found to what might be called the "up-or-out" policy, whereby a person in one of the lower teaching ranks is either promoted to the next higher rank or dismissed from the institution at the end of a definitely stated period. In some cases this policy is written into the statutes or regulations of the institution; in others it is only an administrative policy, but one which is consistently followed. Although definite statement on this policy exists in data from only a limited number of institutions, there is good reason to believe that it is followed in other institutions where legislation on the subject has not been found necessary or advisable.

The up-or-out policy is reported by eight publicly controlled institutions and by 12 which are under control of private organizations. The publicly controlled institutions include six universities and two professional schools; of the institutions under private control four are universities, seven are colleges of arts and sciences,

and one is a professional school. No junior colleges reported this policy.

In 16 of the 20 institutions reporting this policy, it is applicable to instructors only. The remaining four apply it to both instructors and assistant professors. No institution reports application of the up-or-out policy to staff members above the rank of assistant professor.

The period of time which an instructor spends at an institution before this policy becomes applicable varies from three to seven years. Of the 19 institutions reporting on the length of the probationary period, nine set it at four years, four make it five years, two institutions make it three years, and the remaining two institutions set it at six and seven years, respectively. One institution sets the period at from four to six years, and another allows three probationary periods of three years each. One institution furnished no data on this point.

Of the four institutions which apply the up-or-out policy to assistant professors, one is a publicly controlled university and three are private colleges. These four institutions report probationary periods of three, five, six, and seven years, respectively, before the policy becomes operative.

Five private colleges and two public universities permit no deviations from this policy; a few other institutions permit extension of the probationary period to promising instructors under unusual circumstances.

Conclusions

If the salary schedules included in the present analysis are to be accepted as representative of the entire field of higher education, certain conclusions seem warranted:

1. The overlapping schedule seems to be the most popular type, especially among institutions under public control. The discontinuous type comes next and the nonoverlapping, or continuous type, third. Among private institutions there seems to be a wide diversity of type, with the overlapping occurring more frequently than any other. The flat-salary type, with no provision for promotion within a rank, occurs quite frequently among institutions under private control.

2. Automatic or quasi-automatic increments are reported by approximately one-third of all the institutions studied, this proportion running over one-half among institutions under public control and only slightly over one-fourth among private institutions.

There is also a much higher proportion of automatic salary schedules among publicly controlled junior colleges than among other types of institutions. The influence of public school organization and administration may be a factor here; data on the point are not conclusive.

3. The annual increment, smaller in amount than the biennial increment, seems to be generally favored, with the scheduled maximum salary for a given rank about 50 per cent higher than the scheduled minimum salary. The annual increment seems to run approximately five to 10 per cent of the minimum salary, although there is some variation from this practice.

4. While, in general, salary increases as rank increases, there is more spread between salaries in the low ranks and salaries in the high ranks (and inferentially the greater opportunities for promotion in both salary and rank) in professional and technical schools, public or private, and publicly controlled universities, than among other types of school. Publicly controlled colleges of arts and sciences seem to be the least favored in this respect.

5. In like manner, opportunities for promotion within a rank seem to be slightly better among publicly controlled institutions than among those under private control.

6. The up-or-out policy, although not definitely written into the statutes of many institutions, seems to have its adherents, especially among the authorities of private institutions.

THE ASSOCIATION AND THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE PROFESSION

A Report to the Membership

Dear Colleagues:

In a report in the Winter, 1947 issue of this *Bulletin*, entitled "Economic Status, Professional Standards and the General Welfare," I spoke of the rationale of the interest of the American Association of University Professors in the economic status of the profession, namely its interest in professional standards and in the general welfare. In that report I reviewed the work of the Association in seeking a satisfactory economic status for college and university teachers with special reference to recent years, including the action of the Association's Council in reorganizing and reactivating the Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession.

It is with pride that the officers of the Association announce the present membership of the Association's Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession: Albert H. Imlah (History), Tufts College, Chairman; A. Jewell Hughes Bushey (Mathematics), Hunter College; James Holladay (Economics), University of Alabama; Harold N. Lee (Philosophy), Tulane University of Louisiana; Vernon A. Mund (Economics), University of Washington; and William Neiswanger (Economics), University of Illinois. All of the members of this group have demonstrated their interest in and their understanding of the factors that determine economic status in the academic profession. Each has been active in the work of the Chapters at their respective institutions in seeking ways and means to improve the economic status of the faculty. Professors Imlah, Neiswanger, and Mund have contributed articles and reports on this subject that have appeared in the Association's *Bulletin*. Professors Bushey and Lee are former members of the Association's Council, Professor Bushey in addition having served

the Association as Second Vice-President and as Chairman and member, respectively, of the Association's Nominating Committee for the years 1947 and 1948. Professors Imlah and Holladay are at present members of the Association's Council. In addition to the qualifications of the individual members of the Committee, it should be noted that the Committee is representative of the profession as regards geographical distribution and also as regards different types of institutions, a fact that should be conducive to perspective in its work.

The Committee held its first meetings in St. Louis, Missouri on February 26, 27, and 28, 1948 in connection with the Thirty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Association. During these sessions the Committee drafted a report which has subsequently been completed. The text of this report appears on the pages that follow.

Since the meeting in February the members of the Committee have been in continuous communication, and the Committee has undertaken a questionnaire study of the salary schedules of forty-six selected colleges and universities. This sampling has been made to include the several different types of institutions in different geographical areas. As soon as the replies to this questionnaire have been tabulated and evaluated a report based on the study will be published in this *Bulletin*. In the meantime the *Bulletin* will continue to publish from other sources pertinent data in reference to salaries, salary schedules, and related subjects. I refer to such articles as "Professorial Salaries and Tuition, 1947-48: Background and Proposals," by Professor Seymour E. Harris of Harvard University, which appeared in the Spring, 1948 issue of the Association's *Bulletin*, pp. 97-109; to other articles previously published in the *Bulletin* cited in the report "Economic Status, Professional Standards, and the General Welfare" in the Winter, 1947 issue of the *Bulletin*; and to "Construction of College Teachers' Salary Schedules," by Henry G. Badger of the United States Office of Education, which appears in this issue of the *Bulletin*, pp. 406-418.

The economic status of those in the academic profession is determined not only by salaries and salary schedules, the policies that govern promotion, and the principles of tenure observed by the administrations of colleges and universities, but also by the policies that govern retirement. At present there is in progress a

joint study of academic retirement by representatives of our Association and of the Association of American Colleges. It is the expectation of the representatives of these two associations that this study will lead to the formulation of a statement of principles concerning retirement somewhat analogous to the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. In the early fall a special letter will be sent to the officers of the Chapters of our Association requesting Chapter participation in the study. This letter will request data concerning the policies that now govern retirement and will also seek professional opinion and judgment concerning the desirability of these policies, in referring to such matters as the age of retirement—both optional and mandatory—and financial provisions for retirement. Representing our Association in this special study are Professors Edward C. Kirkland, William T. Laprade, and Ralph E. Himstead. In preparation for participation in this study Chapter officers should form a special committee of the Chapter, the function of which will be to facilitate the consideration by the Chapter of the questions that will be submitted to the end that the study of this important subject may receive careful consideration by the profession.

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE PROFESSION

The American Association of University Professors has always recognized that the economic welfare of the profession is one of the important elements in maintaining adequate standards in higher education. The President's Commission on Higher Education, in analyzing the "unprecedented magnitude" of the task ahead and in recommending increased faculty salaries, puts the matter very plainly. "It is not the personal welfare of individual faculty members," the Commission declares, "but the national welfare that is at stake."¹ Among the several agencies which serve as "custodians of the interest of higher education" in the United States, the Association has special responsibilities and opportunities in this matter. In accordance with these responsibilities the

¹ Vol. IV, "Staffing Higher Education," p. 53.

Council of the Association in June, 1946 decided to reorganize its Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession for the purpose of studying the needs created by the current situation. Simultaneously the Chapters were urged to make efforts to improve local conditions and in general to work for upward revision of salary scales to bring them into line with the other professions. The Committee was appointed in October, 1947 and, following correspondence, held meetings in February, 1948. Pursuant to its instructions the Committee now presents the following preliminary report:

I. The Committee strongly recommends that Chapters throughout the country continue to give attention to the adequacy and suitability of salary schedules, pension provisions, and sabbatical arrangements in their own institutions. Chapter activity in these matters offers promise of producing practical results. Only the Chapters can take into account the particular conditions and needs in their own colleges and universities. They can, after careful canvass and discussion of the facts and of the varied interests involved, make specific recommendations and work for improvement through the proper channels. Simply to recover the ground lost in the past decade may require many years of concerted effort. Attention to the problem will therefore need to be steady and continuous, though by no means to the exclusion of the other interests of the Chapters and of the Association. But if this Chapter work is properly done it should prove to be the most tangibly fruitful phase of the efforts of the Association in this matter.

The Committee believes that, since Chapter activity includes many other matters, it will promote more effective accomplishment if each Chapter appoints a strong special committee particularly charged with conducting the local studies designed to form the basis for Chapter action. The Committee suggests that the following topics are particularly important at this time:

1. Whether norms for salary scales are in existence, given due publicity, and measurably observed.
2. Whether the level and spread in the salary scale, and the method and amount of increment for each rank, are sufficient not

only to attract and to hold the right caliber of person, but also to maintain incentive and promote efficiency.

3. Whether salaries are adequate to permit proper use of vacation periods and sabbatical leaves for intellectual refreshment and renewal.

4. Whether sufficient measures have been taken to improve pension and retirement provisions under the drastically reduced annuity table rates now in effect and in the face of higher living costs.

5. Whether a proper faculty-student ratio has been maintained or is being developed.

6. Whether instruction now receives a reasonable and proper share of institutional expenditure or has been crowded and depressed by other demands in recent years.

On all of these, and many other relevant matters, members will find the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education to be a source of information and of studied opinion. The Association has made copies of these reports available to all Chapters. Useful also, for data and methods of approach, are the following articles recently published in the *Bulletin* of the Association:

"Administrative Policies Governing the Salaries of College Teachers," Henry G. Badger (Autumn, 1947).

"Three Case Histories in College Budgeting," Albert H. Imlah (Summer and Autumn, 1947).

"A Comparison of Salaries in the Academic Profession with Those in the Federal Civil Service," George W. Kyte (Summer, 1947).

"What Has Happened to Professors' Salaries Since 1940," Sumner H. Slichter (Winter, 1946).

"The Economic Status of the Profession—A Symposium of Opinion and Suggestions" (Autumn, 1946).

"The Economic Status of the Profession—A Forum on Ways and Means" (Spring, 1947).

II. The Committee also recommends the following measures as useful aids to the Chapters and to other groups interested in the problem of restoring and improving the economic status of the profession:

1. That annual statistical studies of salary conditions at selected institutions be made by this Association through the Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession and that the results be published regularly in the *Bulletin*. For this purpose the Committee recommends that the Association seek to secure a grant of a suitable amount from one of the Foundations.

2. That the Association should, for the present, continue the arrangement recently effected through the efforts of the General Secretary, of supplying secretarial assistance for the preparation of comprehensive studies by the U. S. Office of Education in co-ordination with the activities of this Committee.

3. That an additional member of the professional staff of the central office be appointed to take care of the increasing volume of correspondence for advice and information on this and related matters. It would undoubtedly be very useful also, if this secretary could visit Chapters from time to time, not only to speak to the members but also to confer with the executive committees of the Chapters with respect to procedure and principles in this and other matters.

4. That there be published in the *Bulletin* notes on other publications bearing on this subject, and summaries of significant chapter actions and studies.

ALBERT H. IMLAH (History), Tufts College, *Chairman*
JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY (Mathematics), Hunter College
JAMES HOLLADAY (Economics), University of Alabama
HAROLD N. LEE (Philosophy), Tulane University of Louisiana
VERNON A. MUND (Economics), University of Washington
WILLIAM A. NEISWANGER (Economics), University of Illinois

Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the date of censuring are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations.

John B. Stetson University, De Land, Florida (October, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 377-399)	December, 1939
West Chester State Teachers College West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	December, 1939
Adelphi College, Garden City, New York (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 494-517)	December, 1941
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	December, 1941
State Teachers College, ¹ Murfreesboro, Tennessee (December, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 662-677)	May, 1943
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina (April, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 173-176)	May, 1943
Memphis State College, Memphis, Tennessee (October, 1943 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 550-580)	April, 1944
University of Missouri, Columbia and Rolla, Missouri (Summer, 1945 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 278-315)	June, 1946
University of Texas, Austin, Texas (Winter, 1944 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 627-634; Autumn, 1945 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 462-465; Summer, 1946 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 374-385)	June, 1946

¹ Now Middle Tennessee State College.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership in the Association is by the Committee on Admission of Members upon nomination by one Active Member. Election takes place thirty days after the name of the nominee has been published in the *Bulletin*. The membership year in the Association is the calendar year (January 1 through December 31). The membership of nominees whose nominations are received before July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the current year. The membership of nominees whose nominations are received after July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the following year unless the nominee requests that his membership become effective as of January 1 of the current year.

The classes and conditions of membership are as follows:

Active. A person is eligible for election to Active membership if he holds a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an institution on the Association's eligible list, provided his work consists of at least half-time teaching or research. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Junior. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions and who are not eligible for Active membership. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Associate. Associate membership is not an elective membership. Active and Junior Members whose work becomes primarily administrative are transferred to Associate membership. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Emeritus. Any member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred to Emeritus membership.

Emeritus Members are exempt from dues. They may continue to receive the *Bulletin* at a special rate of \$1.00 a year.

Continuing Eligibility. Change of occupation or transfer to an institution not on the Association's eligible list does not affect eligibility for continuance of membership.

Interruption or Termination of Membership. Interruption or termination of membership requires notification to the Association's Washington office. In the absence of such notice, membership continues with receipt of the *Bulletin* for one calendar year, during which time there is an obligation to pay dues.

Nominations for Membership

The following 1428 nominations for Active membership and 28 nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided by the Constitution. In accordance with action by the Council, objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, who will in turn transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members if received within thirty days after this publication. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of the nominee for membership as provided in the Constitution.

Active

Adams State College, Tom R. Thomson; **Adelphi College**, George Alterman, Ruth Applegit, Richard A. Bodtke, Harry Brenowitz, Helen D. Clement, Marion J. Collins, William L. Curry, Philip L. Defiese, Dorothy R. Disher, Robert Ernst, Kurt Friedrich, Charles S. Hall, Elmer J. Heinecke, Paul Langellier, Ruth Mallay, Helen E. Murphy, James G. Murray, David M. Sanders, Charles L. Savage, Katharine I. Smith, John S. Thompson; **Air University**, W. R. Rucker; **University of Akron**, Francis A. Clark, Elizabeth Helmkamp, Ellen C. Millisor, Louis Ross; **Alabama College**, Murray C. Flynn, Sidney A. Forsythe, Laura B. Hadley, Frank N. Philpot; **Alabama Polytechnic Institute**, Charles I. Adams, Martin L. Beck, William W. Belvin, John W. Borchardt, Ernestine I. Frazier, Jewel Golden, E. D. Hess, Alma McDougall, Carroll C. Stalnaker, Harris W. Wilson; **Alabama State Teachers College (Jacksonville)**, Donald J. Salls; **Alabama State Teachers College (Troy)**, Henry E. Sterkx; **University of Alabama**, Charles E. Bounds, Woodrow W. Boyett, Ralph Chermock, James W. Clark, Orrin H. Cross, James F. Doster, O. B. Emerson, William S. Gamble, Alan Hisey, Elliott M. Mc-

Ginnies, Stephen L. Mooney, Anne Pannell, Werner A. Pohle, W. J. Sensing; **Albion College**, William B. Ackerman, James W. Brock, Albert Munk; **American International College**, Harold E. Bowie, Henrietta Littlefield, Margaret L. Ramos; **American University**, Donald Derby, Rudolph Von Abele; **Amherst College**, Bruce B. Benson; **Appalachian State Teachers College**, Graydon P. Eggers; **Arizona State College (Tempe)**, Bertha H. Autenrieth, Bess J. Barkley, John E. Christensen, Miles A. Dresskell, Dorothy F. Gillanders, Genevieve Hargiss, Nina L. Murphy, Robert N. Plummer, Sydney Smith, Kenneth M. Stewart, Ronald G. Thomson; **Arkansas State Teachers College**, Paul T. Nolan; **University of Arkansas**, Marx J. Pales, Theresa M. Renner; **Augustana College and Theological Seminary**, Dellarose Brooks, Anita P. Smith; **Bates College**, August Buschmann, Roy P. Fairfield, Fred C. Mabee, Alfred W. Painter; **Baylor University**, Hugh O. Davis; **Berea College**, Elizabeth Gilbert, Lester F. Pross; **Boston University**, Hans Apel, Dugold S. Arbuckle, William C. Barrett, Jr., Allen E. Beckwith, Louis Cornell, Arbie M. Dale, Jr., Warner C. Danforth, Carl B. Everberg, James Fawcett, Joseph P. French, George P. Fulton, John V. Gilmore, Samuel B. Gould, William W. Happ, Charles R. Holbrook, Harold Howarth, Arthur G. Humes, Robert L. Kane, Jr., Herbert D. Lamson, William L. Lomax, Raymond L. Mannix, Henry E. Sargent, Robert W. Sherburne, Henry H. Stafford, Arthur J. Sullivan, Richard R. Towle, Donald J. Winslow; **Bowdoin College**, Jean L. Darbelnet, Lawrence Pelletier, **Bowling Green State University**, Cecil M. Freeburne; **Bradley University**, Glendon O. Arvin, James B. Campbell, Allen Cannon, Romeo B. Garrett, Stanley W. Niehaus, William T. Reid, Jr., Erwin Van Allen; **University of Bridgeport**, William F. Allen, J. Marie Anderwald, Isabel E. Colby, Abraham E. Knepler, David O. Long, Mary A. McGuire, Robert R. Mayhew, Maurice Ozer, Charles F. Petitjean; **University of British Columbia**, Edmund Morrison, William Robbins; **Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn**, Thomas L. Donahue, Harry P. Gregor, M. Thomas O'Shaughnessy, Jr., Louis Zukofsky; **Brown University**, Edward A. Bloom, Milton H. Sugarman; **Bryn Mawr College**, Richard Bernheimer, William E. Norris; **Bucknell University**, Lewis J. Ives, Jr., Wendell I. Smith, Roderick O. Williams; **University of Buffalo**, Lillian Gough, Francis P. Kowalewski, Jr., Jeannette M. Kryn; **Butler University**, Ethel L. Lett; **California Institute of Technology**, Anthonie Van Harreveld; **University of California**, Byron C. Guyer, Barbara M. Kennedy; George M. Kuznets, Charles B. Morrey, Jr., Cecilia Ross; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, John C. Crowell; **University of California (Santa Barbara)**, Clayton Wilson; **Carthage College**, Oscar F. Bale, Ralph M. Hansen, Martin T. Monson, J. Bryce Sardiga, Altman K. Swihart; **Catholic University of America**, E. G. Stanley Baker, E. Catherine Dunn, Regina F. Herzfeld, Martin J. Higgins, Jr., Sister Marie C. Klinkhamer, Francis O. Rice, John W. Stafford; **Centenary College of Louisiana**, Horace A. Hays, Robert A. Moody, Mary E. Prude; **Centre College of Kentucky**, Jack B. Kellam, W. Ben Lane, Carl E. Misch, James T. Richardson, Marjorie Smith; **Chapman College**, Werner E. Bracher; **University of Chicago**, V. George Bobrinskoy, Theodore B.

Rasmussen, W. Allen Wallis; **University of Cincinnati**, James M. Alexander, Jr., Cyril G. Allen, John G. Imhoff, Richard H. Strauss; **The Citadel**, John J. Mahoney, III; **The City College**, Thomas H. Bembry, Herbert G. Birch, Nathan Birnbaum, Harold E. Djourup, Herbert P. Habel, Eugene L. Hartley, Nat Holman, Morris Kolodney, Rose E. Kushner, Jacob Landy, Silvester Liotta, Simon Lissim, Paul H. Maurer, Arthur Nelson, Raymond Purcell, Gertrude Schmeidler, Frank K. Shuttleworth, William J. Withrow; **The City College (Commerce Center)**, Kathryn E. Maxfield, John W. Wingate; **Clemson Agricultural College**, George M. Armstrong, George H. Aull, Clifton W. Carter, Carson D. Evans, Davis G. Hughes, Jackson V. McElveen; **Colby College**, Gordon W. McKey; **Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Robert E. Atkinson, Irene Bostrom, J. Frank Cassel, Andrew G. Clark, Catherine R. Clark, Della M. Cortner, C. Richard Creek, Harris T. Guard, Aurelia B. Harlan, Leota C. Hayward, Elmer C. Hunter, Bruno Klinger, John C. McKinnon, M. Leslie Madison, Bert B. Mischke, James L. Paschal, Austin O. Simonds, Lester H. Stimmel, Howard E. Thomas, Walter D. Thomas, Jr., William L. White, Jr.; **Colorado School of Mines**, Hilbert E. Fletcher; **Western State College of Colorado**, James E. Leach; **University of Colorado**, Walter M. Campbell; **Columbia University**, Eli Ginzberg; **Concord College**, Nettie L. Kitchen, Arthur Madonick; **Teachers College of Connecticut**, Walter Adamson, Stanley E. Ballinger, Carl B. Bomhoff, Theodore I. Lenn; **University of Connecticut (Fort Trumbull Branch)**, Chandler D. Ingersoll; **Cooper Union**, Walter S. Watson; **Cornell University**, Donald C. Blanding; **Culver-Stockton College**, Eleanor Daniells, Mary Lee Forsyth, Lacey L. Leftwich, Melville Peterson, Justin M. Walker, Harold K. Whittier; **Davidson College**, Gordon R. Wood; **Delaware State College**, Maurice E. Thomasson; **University of Delaware**, Hilda Somers; **University of Denver**, Frances P. Crenshaw, Anna F. Dudack, Jerome J. Kesselman, Campbell G. Murphy, Albert W. Recht; **DePaul University**, John P. Fitzgerald, David B. Itkin; **De Pauw University**, Vera P. Laski, Donald H. White; **Dickinson College**, J. Douglas Mertz, Francis W. Warlow; **Drury College**, Virginia F. Runge; **Duke University**, William N. Breswick, Philip Handler, Louis deR. MacMillan, Abe L. Shugerman, Edward C. Simmons; **Earlham College**, Ruby Davis, Laurette C. Mosier; **Elmira College**, Raymond B. Stevens; **Elon College**, Georg A. H. Johnson; **Emory University**, Sidney C. Madden, Agnes L. Reagan; **Erskine College**, Marcus B. Caldwell, Joseph A. Kohout, William Yarborough; **Evansville College**, William F. Affolder, Ray C. Boggs, John A. Boyd, Jean Bridges, Esther Brown, Martin Chanin, Charles G. Colvin, Opal H. De Lancey, Thomas W. Doherty, Robert W. Emmert, Harris D. Erickson, Paul E. Kelly, James E. Morlock, Richard F. O'Dell, Sylvia Olmstead, Milton O. Peacock, Keith Slater, Russell C. Tuttle, George Q. Voigt, Frederick T. Wessel; **Fayetteville State Teachers College**, John W. Parker; **Florida Southern College**, Donald A. Thompson; **Florida State University**, Agnes C. Brown, Margaret L. Brown, Edna M. Howard, Bess Lance, Florine E. Marlatt, Madaline W. Nichols, Louise Pickle, Ina Van Stan; **University of Florida**, Carroll F. Cumbee,

Robert D. Walker, Jr.; **Franklin College of Indiana**, Dora M. Bell, Elijah L. Jacobs, Louis B. Matthews, George E. Maynard; **Fresno State College**, Myron Anderson, Peter Beiden, Robert C. Burgess, Jr., Kenneth C. Gleason, Cornelius A. Warmerdam; **Geneva College**, Martha A. Cook, John T. Doult, Alured C. Ransom, Margaret Ripper, Russell S. Rosenberger, Kenneth Saxton; **George Washington University**, Cary D. Eldridge; **Georgia Institute of Technology**, Le Roy A. Woodward; **University of Georgia**, Hal Hulsey, Lawrence E. Metcalf, Richard H. Smith, Wesley P. Watkins; **Gettysburg College**, Sheldon C. Ackley, Harry F. Bolich, Wallace E. Fisher, Ángel Franco, Henry C. Kogler, Jr., Heinz Langerhans, Harold M. Messer, Robert C. Riley, Clemens A. Seils; **Goucher College**, Helen V. Crouse, Ernest Lert, Carlos Rivera; **Greensboro College**, Raymond A. Smith, Grinnell College, Ernest F. Andrews, Jr., Donald R. Low; **Grove City College**, Cyril L. Elsdon; **Guilford College**, Rud S. Meyerstein; **Hamilton College**, Louis F. Forest, Mitchel Wendell; **Hamline University**, Theta H. Wolf; **Harvard University**, Jacob E. Finesinger; **University of Hawaii**, Clifton Cornwell, Jr., William A. Frazier, Norman Meller; **Hofstra College**, Sara G. Scherff; **Howard University**, Erna L. Magnus; **Hunter College**, John W. Wieler; **Idaho State College**, Mary L. Forsyth, William P. Kitaj; **University of Idaho**, Eugene Giles, A. Lucille Magruder, Leo Seren, Frederick H. Werth; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, Arnold J. Bakaler, Samuel F. Bibb, Eugene Freeman, Walter Garbalinski, Helena Gavin, Arthur G. Giles, Paul W. Harrison, Robert L. Janes, Willard A. Kerr, Benjamin Lease, Arnold G. Meister, Ludwig Mies van der Rohr, Mary L. Mojonier, Elmore S. Pettyjohn, Samuel E. Rusinoff, Don Scott, Henry C. Spencer, Maurice Spielman, Joanne G. Starr; **Illinois State Normal University**, G. Harlowe Evans, William J. Griffin; **Eastern Illinois State College**, Kenneth E. Damann; **Western Illinois State College**, Robert J. Clow, John S. McVickar, R. Felix Morrison; **Northern Illinois State Teachers College**, Rodney E. Anderson; **Southern Illinois University**, Ralph H. Boatman, Jr., Kenneth A. Ervin; **University of Illinois**, Donna D. Finger, Mildred I. Henry, Andrew Longacre, Frederick D. Miles, Wilson N. Stewart, Eugene P. Whiteside; **University of Illinois (Galesburg)**, Alan Dailey; **University of Illinois (Navy Pier)**, Shirley A. Bill, Johanna Braunfeld, Louis Broussard, Gleah D. Brown, Marion D. Cohn, Paul H. Connors, Jr., Marjorie L. Croft, Martha Q. Denny, Rebecca A. Dewey, Agnes McN. Donohue, Mae A. Driscoll, Evelyn Frank, James F. Groves, Arnold J. Hartoch, Patricia A. Heffernan, Lucy Hegie, Margaret R. Henderson, Rose Hornacek, Helen J. Hovde, Willis Jackman, Anna W. Kenny, Vincetta Kibort, Jeanne Kiley, Laurette Kirstein, Willie N. Love, Blanche McGuire, Robert C. Marsh, Charlotte M. Munzer, Sara C. Niederman, Kathryn H. Quinlan, M. June Richey, Cecilia M. Rudin, Joan H. Savage, Helen W. Sears, Kenneth Shopen, Albert F. Silkett, Clara S. Skogen, Elizabeth Teichmann, Beatrice S. Timmis, Hazel C. Vardaman, Lucille J. Webster, Maurita Willett, Rena M. Williams, Ernest S. Willner, Elizabeth V. Wright, Jeannette M. Zeimer; **Indiana University**, Vincent J. Bruno, George W. Hoffman, LeRoy H. Klemm, Charles M. Long, Joseph Schmuckler; **Iowa State Teachers Col-**

lege, Elwood J. Keister, M. B. Smith; **State University of Iowa**, George E. Evans, Howard V. Meredith, Chester I. Miller, Ray V. Smith, Harry H. Wade; **James Millikin University**, Howard E. Akers, Francis R. Brown; **John Carroll University**, John G. Allen, Jr., Angelo Danesino, Bernard S. Jablonski; **John Tarleton Agricultural College**, Kathleen Parker; **Johns Hopkins University**, Alphonse Chapanis, E. Kenneth Haviland, Richard H. Howland, Clarence D. Long; **Fort Hays Kansas State College**, Katherine I. Bogart, Kenneth Cook, John D. Garwood, Alice Morrison, E. J. Spomer, Roberta C. Stout; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Elbert L. Barnhart, Jeanette Bigge, Margaret B. Coghill, Denis Cowan, Rosa Hagerman, Myrl Long; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Lawrence E. Curfman, Ruth Moon, Evelyn Triplett; **University of Kansas**, Antonio P. de Albuquerque, Melvin C. Cotton, Arturo Hernandez, W. Keith Weltmer, Duane G. Wenzel, Marie Wilkins; **University of Kansas City**, Fred Duffelmeyer; **Kent State University**, Frank E. Ballenger, Charlotte Davis, Sarah Dunning, William J. Weiskopf; **Kentucky State College**, Henry E. Cheaney, Joseph G. Fletcher, William W. Jones, Paul J. Manly, Clarice J. Michaels, Cee Vee Smith; **University of Kentucky**, Jacqueline Bull, Norma B. Cass, Kate T. Irvine, Catherine L. Katterjohn, James F. Light, Ruth Pinnell, Francis M. Pulliam, Carolyn E. Reading, Ellen B. Stutsman; **Kenyon College**, William D. Berg, James R. Browne; **Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery**, Vernon H. Casner, John F. DeYonker, Martin L. Riemann, Claus A. Rohweder, Carl B. Umanzio; **Knox College**, Robert M. Putnam, Robert F. Wilde; **Lebanon Valley College**, Maude P. Laughlin, Hilbert V. Lochner, John F. Lotz, Hiram H. Shenk, Bruce C. Souder; **Lewis and Clark College**, Marjorie A. Fessenden, Elvy Fredrickson, Cloyd V. Gustafson, Philip S. McAllister, Hester H. Turner, Frances B. Turrell; **Limestone College**, Rachel B. Pierce, Merrell L. Sherburn; **Lincoln Memorial University**, Amelia E. Clark; **Lindenwood College**, Martha M. Boyer, Charles C. Clayton, Paul Friess, Robert D. Hume, Juliet McCrory, Rachel Morris, Milton F. Rehag, Mary Shultz, Pearl W. Walker; **Linfield College**, Franklin Mitchell; **Southeastern Louisiana College**, Margaret D. Lowe; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana**, Lucille T. Carnahan, Eltor B. Doering; **Louisiana Polytechnic Institute**, T. W. Ray Johnson, Garnie W. McGinty, O. C. Miller, Gladys Peck, H. J. Sachs, Harold J. Smolinski, Scott Weathersby; **Louisiana State University**, Alfredo Berumen, Waldo W. Braden, Dallas Draper, Robert E. Dreher, Milton S. Goldberg, John J. Guilbeau, George W. D. Hamlett, Charles C. Harris, David T. Herman, Robert B. Holtman, B. Worthington Horne, D. W. McPheeters, Edna L. Magaw, Judith Major, Francine Merritt, Paul A. Moylan, Teresina S. Muñoz, Frank C. Page, Octavio E. Pérez, Thomas H. Phillips, V. Lucile Ruby, William M. Smith, Earl D. Stout, John A. Thompson, Philip W. West, James R. Young; **University of Louisville**, Creighton Gilbert, Aubrey E. Harvey, Jr., Louis C. Kesselman, Robert L. McGeachin, James R. Merritt, Roger L. Robertson, Rodney L. Wells; **Loyola University (Illinois)**, William A. Gerhard, Arnando Gianelli, Peter Kavanagh; **Lycoming College**, Phil G. Gillette, George S. Goodell,

Frances E. Knights, Mary J. Marley, Donald G. Remley, T. Sherman Stanford, Joseph N. Whitten; **MacMurray College for Women**, F. Faith Finnberg; **Macalaster College**, John M. Adams, Robert J. Dasset, Jr., Marjorie Johans, Rose Setterberg; **University of Maine**, John W. Beamesderfer, Joseph I. Hall, Jerome M. Seidman, Vincent E. Shainin, Robert B. Thomson, Dorothy H. Wentworth; **Manhattan College**, Matthew J. Brennan, James V. Mullaney; **University of Manitoba**, Edmund G. Berry, William M. Sibley; **Marshall College**, Lloyd L. Brown, Ruby C. Foose, Cleo M. Gray, Jeanne Owen; **University of Maryland**, E. Aubert Mooney, Jr., Eric H. Small, **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, John R. Loofbouroow; **University of Massachusetts (Fort Devens)**, E. Merrill Reed; **Meharry Medical College**, Katherine C. Dandridge, Daniel T. Rolfe, Robert F. Sanford, Alexander A. Williams; **Memphis State College**, Sam Anderson, Fisher A. Buckingham, Raymond J. Coltharp, Edward I. Crawford, James C. Crumbaugh, H. B. Evans, J. W. Fox, John R. Gordon, George Harris, Bess L. Henderson, Elmore Holmes, C. C. Humphreys, C. C. Ijams, Howard S. Kaltenborn, Elna B. McBride, Chester H. McNees, William D. Miller, Atheus S. Rudolph, H. E. Rumble, L. E. Snyder; **Miami University**, Marie B. Kraft; **University of Miami**, Clifford Montgomery, Iris A. O'Neal; **Central Michigan College of Education**, Karolena M. Fox; **Northern Michigan College of Education**, Holmes Boynton, Lynn H. Halverson, Russell Thomas; **Western Michigan College of Education**, John D. Amey, Jr., Leonard V. Meretta; **Michigan College of Mining and Technology**, Calvin H. Maxson; **Michigan State College**, Adrian H. Jaffe, Dorothy W. Lossing, Herbert Weisinger; **Michigan State Normal College**, Paul M. Mancell; **University of Michigan**, Irving H. Anderson, Tom C. Battin, John J. Carey, Wilfred M. Kincaid, William C. Morse, Donald R. Pearce; **Middlebury College**, Donald S. Putnam; **Mills College**, Meidel Applegate, Isabel M. Schevill; **Milwaukee-Downer College**, Mary S. Benson; **Minnesota State Teachers College (Bemidji)**, Elton W. Beck; **University of Minnesota**, Rena Boyle, Henry L. Hansen, Thor Kommedahl, Alvin H. Larson, M. B. Moore, Robert E. Moore, Edward Ney, Paul R. O'Connor, Frank Oppenheimer, Robert A. Phillips, Margaret Randall, Lucy A. Studley; **University of Minnesota (Duluth Branch)**, Vivian P. Meredith; **Mississippi State College**, Alester G. Holmes, Jr.; **University of Mississippi**, George A. Carbone, John D. Reese, James E. Savage; **Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy**, Glenn C. Boyer, Karl M. Moulder; **Central Missouri College**, Courtney C. Aldrich, Jr., Berthe Daniel, Forrest Foor, Earl R. Foster, Mildred M. Lass, Frank W. Lidal, John P. Morris; **Southwest Missouri State College**, Basil B. Bassett; **University of Missouri**, Anna S. Husband; **Missouri Valley College**, Bruce Stewart; **Montana State College**, Marguerita McDonald, Doris E. Wilson; **Eastern Montana State Normal School**, Arthur T. Hill, Richard Meens; **Montana State University**, E. Joe DeMaris, Charles E. Hamilton, David Miller, J. Earll Miller; **Morehead State Teachers College**, Hubert J. McShea; **Morgan State College**, Cleveland J. Franks, M. Theresa Kennedy, Roland C. McConnell, Ruth A. Matthews, U. Simpson Stubbs, Jr., Idel W. E. Taylor,

Isaiah A. Woodward; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney)**, Kermit M. Laidig; **University of Nebraska**, Robert Black, John D. Blyth, Mary L. Boehm, Paul L. Bogen, Ray B. Browne, Kathryn S. Dean, William C. Dempsey, Arthur W. Duning, Oliver Evans, David B. Foltz, William H. Foxwell, Frank Glick, Earnest L. Harrison, Irwin L. Hathaway, Roscoe E. Hill, Harold D. Huestis, Ralph M. Ibata, Rhea Keeler, Hollie L. Lepley, Arthur L. Murphy, Gladys Pickett, C. E. Pulos, Edward B. Schmidt, Bernice Slote, J. Dayton Smith, Freda N. Spaulding, Robert E. Stepp, Clemens B. Thoman, Fred W. Voget; **New England Conservatory of Music**, Jean Ellerson, Elizabeth Golden; **University of New Hampshire**, Donald E. Steele; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Jersey City)**, John Reckzeh; **New Mexico State College**, Albert J. Hatch; **New Mexico Highlands University**, Anne Lohrli, Haridas T. Muzumdar; **New Mexico State Teachers College**, John H. Amy, Adelaide Glaser, Wilma A. Peterson; **University of New Mexico**, Everton Conger, Lucy L. Hazard, Arnold H. Price, Marie P. Wallis; **Associated Colleges of Upper New York (Champlain College)**, Carl Knudsen, Peter H. Sawitz, Hilda Uchiyamada; **(Mohawk College)**, Howard K. Andersen, Charles L. Best, Morris Budin, Martin B. Fried, Walter J. Michels, Samuel A. Weiss; **New York State Teachers College (Cortland)**, G. Raymond Fisk, Ina M. Hayes, R. Dean Schick, Linda C. Smith; **New York State Teachers College (Oswego)**, Norman E. Whitten; **New York State Teachers College (Plattsburg)**, Nathan E. Kullman, Jr.; **New York University**, John L. Landgraf, Sidney Levy, Ben Yablonky; **Newark College of Engineering**, Monroe L. Norden; **North Carolina College at Durham**, Sankie E. Floyd, Julia W. Harris, Joseph S. Himes, Jr.; **North Carolina State College**, John L. Evers, Daniel S. Grosch, Lindsay R. Whichard, Merle W. Wing; **University of North Carolina**, Joseph E. Adams, Nicholson B. Adams, James O. Bailey, Wayne A. Bowers, Henry P. Brandis, Jr., Edward A. Brecht, Kenneth M. Brinkhous, Lee M. Brooks, Richard P. Calhoun, Clyde C. Carter, Emil T. Chanlett, Donald P. Costello, John M. Couch, Edward T. Draper-Savage, Robert Y. Durand, Alfred G. Engstrom, Preston H. Epps, William M. Geer, Wesley C. George, John B. Graham, Paul N. Guthrie, Waldo E. Haisley, Jr., Edwin P. Hiatt, John E. Ivey, Jr., Richard E. Jamerson, William S. Jenkins, Guy B. Johnson, Claiborne S. Jones, Louis O. Kattsoff, Lucile Kelling, Samuel B. Knight, Frank J. Kottke, John E. Larsh, Jr., Daniel A. MacPherson, William G. Madow, Edwin C. Markham, David G. Monroe, Lucy S. Morgan, Arnold Nash, George E. Nicholson, Jr., John A. Parker, Woodrow W. Pate, William D. Perry, William H. Poteat, Daniel O. Price, Herbert Robbins, William E. Rosenstengel, Harry K. Russell, Phillips Russell, Walter Spearman, Eunice N. Tyler, Rupert B. Vance, Charles D. Van Cleave, Maurice T. Van Hecke, James M. Webb, Earl Wynn; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Alfred F. Bordeleau, Carl O. Clagett, E. V. Estensen, Laurence O. Henry, Samuel Saden, Edward J. Schroepfer; **Northwestern University**, Zelma Leonhard, Henry M. Oliver, Jr., Grundy Steiner, Benton J. Underwood; **University of Notre Dame**, Fred B. Govern; **Oberlin College**, Martin Nozick, W. Arthur Turner, Warren F. Walker, Jr.; **Occidental College**, Roger

K. Burke, Howard J. McMurray; **Ohio State University**, Stuart N. Adams, John W. Bennett, Dowald J. Hager, Christen T. Jonassen, Melvin Seeman, James N. Spuhler, Clarence E. Taft, Kurt H. Wolff; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Jack B. Pfeiffer; **Oklahoma College for Women**, Otho A. McGuffee; **University of Oklahoma**, Mildred T. Faris, Garold D. Holstine, Elroy L. Rice; **University of Omaha**, Robert O. Benecke, Roderic B. Crane, Violet Du Bois, Leta Holley, John G. McMillan, Robert L. Moss-holder, Hedvig C. M. Nyholm, Wilfred Payne, Dorothy Relleke, Harry L. Rice, Jack G. Somny, Paul J. Stageman; **Oregon State College**, George H. Barnes, Ernest R. Bartley, Norborne Berkeley, Ramona E. Berry, Virgil Bett, Charles H. Bowen, Chester O. Broders, Irene Butts, Morton Cronin, Louise L. Daniels, William A. Davies, Ralph G. De Moisy, Marie Diedesch, J. Richard Dilworth, Florence Felde, E. Alta Garrison, Evan K. Gibson, Gordon W. Gilkey, Earl Goddard, Milton Gordon, Robert D. Harris, Betty E. Hawthorne, Oscar F. Hoffman, Harold F. Hollands, Joseph G. LaPalombara, L. R. La Vallee, Margaret L. Lawrence, Marie Ledbetter, John F. Ligon, Jr., Ruth McCorkle, Albert W. Marsh, Gayle C. Merklin, Ethel P. Morgan, Ruth A. Moser, Ruth A. Musselman, Faith G. Norris, Henry R. Patterson, John A. Pfanner, Jr., Ethel L. Reddick, Hildred A. Rice, Sidney Rubin, Elizabeth W. Savage, Cairns K. Smith, Edward D. Smith, Robert W. Smith, Helen R. Snipper, June H. Sullivan, Kline R. Swygard, Harold Vatter, Robert B. Walls, Margaret C. Ware, Miriam A. Wiggenhorn, Norman Wilson; **University of Oregon**, Jack Wilkinson; **Pennsylvania State College**, Erich Auerbach, Edna S. Bouchal, Caesar G. Chmielewski, Kenneth R. Davenport, Suzanne Davison, Vito J. Di Vincenzo, Jack L. Durall, John S. Egli, Clarence A. Ellsworth, John C. Garey, John C. Griffiths, Thomas M. Hunter, James F. Keim, Eugene T. McDonald, Lois Neifert, W. B. Shepperd, David Van Meter, George Zoretich; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Millersville)**, Virginia Beck; **University of Pennsylvania**, Edward F. Cantlin, Mildred E. Gebhard, Helen Huus, A. Herbert Marbach, Conyers Read; **Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science**, John A. Novack; **Phoenix College**, Mario Zito; **University of Pittsburgh**, James J. Barry, Sidie R. Bononi, Clair M. Bunting, Samuel R. Cornelius, M. Grace Hetrick, Wayne W. Hill, George W. McLaren, Jr., James E. Martin, Gilbert M. Mellin, John H. Neiler, Michael A. Plesher, Harvey J. Pope, W. Edward Sell, Nevin Smith, Charles A. Woods, Jr.; **University of Puerto Rico**, Aida R. Caro Costas; **Purdue University**, Sydney H. Gould, Harold C. Johansen, Alanson D. Topping; **Randolph-Macon Woman's College**, John S. G. Carson, Mary Klemm, Paul A. Walker; **Rhode Island State College**, Harry E. Gould; **Rice Institute**, James S. Fulton; **University of Richmond**, William E. Bickley; **Ripon College**, Harold Chamberlain, Walter Moffatt; **University of Rochester**, Frank M. Berger; **Rollins College**, George W. Freeman; **Roosevelt College**, C. Arne Arenberg, Hermann C. Bowersox, Benjamin Burack, Edward M. A. Chandler, Donna Glyndon, Charles Kaplan, Eric Kruh, Seymour I. Mandell, Siegfried Marck, Emanuel Merdinger, Ray-

mond H. Palmer, Alan T. Street, D. Crane Taylor, Adrian Tieleman; **Russell Sage College**, Genesa Long, Arthur R. McKay; **Rutgers University**, Gellert S. Alleman, Madison C. Bates, Robert L. Bates, Charles I. Biederman, Mary C. Brill, Lyman B. Burbank, Oscar K. Buros, George Y. Cherlin, John M. Cross, George J. Cukro, Ruth Davids, Horace J. De Podwin, Clarence A. Discher, Alexander Ehrenberg, Justin B. Galford, Marina Garcíá, Max Gideonse, Emerson Golden, Adolph W. Goodman, James C. Hall, Margaret Hastings, Richard E. Henry, Alfred Hower, Clarence V. Hubbard, Edward Huberman, Anton M. Huffert, Irene B. Jordan, Leah S. Joseph, John Keosian, Helen Krich, Lothar P. Kuhniss, David Lilien, Dorothy P. Malamis, Alfred B. Mann, T. Vassar Morton, Alice M. Pollin, Henry Popkin, Bennett M. Rich, Harold L. Rubenstein, Hubert G. Schmidt, John B. Schmitt, Samuel I. Schoffman, Bernard Sherak, Irving A. Spaulding, Morgan Upton, Leo Wittes, Edward H. Zabriskie; **St. John's University**, Frank E. Bulda; **St. Lawrence University**, John J. Carroll, Kurt Neuse; **St. Louis University**, Alexander V. Bushkovitch, Charles N. Jordan; **St. Michael's College**, Robert K. Griffin; **College of St. Thomas**, Alfred H. Speltz; **Sam Houston State Teachers College**, Leon Pledger; **San Bernardino Valley College**, Harold S. Confer, C. Dale Robbins; **San Diego State College**, Claude F. Merzbacher; **City College of San Francisco**, Marjorie S. Cullen; **San Francisco State College**, Maurice R. Amsden, Sherman L. Brown, Eleanore Bushnell, Douglas J. Clark, Daniel S. Farmer, Arthur J. Hall, Harold H. Harden, John S. Hensill, Doris D. Holtz, Seymour Locks, Boyd McCandless, Clarence A. Miller, Bernice Van G. Peterson, Leonard T. Pockman, Thelwall Proctor, Caroline Shrodes, Andrew H. Trice, Chloe McK. Usis, Antoinette Willson; **San Mateo Junior College**, James W. Dilley, Samuel B. Hepburn, David G. Rempel; **Colleges of the Seneca**, Robert L. Anthony, Aaron Bell, George H. Fathauer; **Seton Hall College**, Americo P. Cocco, Nicholas D. De Prospro, Leonard L. Ritchie; **Shurtleff College**, Webster O. Crane, Mary A. Keirle; **Simpson College**, Lawrence G. Lavengood, Edna C. Miller; **Skidmore College**, Helen M. Brown, Ernst Waldinger; **University of South Carolina**, Lois Dicks, Virginia Gourdin, James W. Hassell, Algin B. King; **South Dakota State College**, Paul L. Carson; **University of South Dakota**, Harry E. Olson; **University of Southern California**, Milton Dickens, Tilden W. Roberts, H. Lawrence Wilsey; **Southern Methodist University**, Ogden Baine, Carl H. Cummings, Harold Jeskey, Ray M. Matson, Arthur Richards, Israel W. Santry, Jr., Lloyd H. Shinnners, Sophus Thompson, Frank L. Williams, Charles L. Wisseman; **Southern University**, Princess M. Bowen, E. Marie Ervin, Ira L. Ferguson, Beatrice H. Grevenberg, Ula M. Keeler, John S. Lash, Lionel H. Newsom, Edward L. Patterson, Jr., Samuella V. Totty, Frederick A. Williams; **Southwestern**, Benjamin A. Wooten, Jr.; **Stanford University**, William A. Bonner, George H. Houck, Alexander L. London, John McClelland, Hayes A. Newby, Juan B. Rael, Douglas A. Skoog, William A. Spurr, William C. Steele, John L. Taylor, Lowell Turrentine; **Stephen F. Austin State College**, Ida Pritchett, Robert L. Turner; **Stephens College**, Lydia Back, Howard P. Baker, James E. Baxter, Edwin B. Libbey,

Halvor G. Melom, Dorothy Pollock, Melania Rogers, Edward M. Ryan, Edgar F. Van Buskirk, Vera Z. Washburne; **Stout Institute**, Herman C. Arneson; **Sul Ross State Teachers College**, Clifford B. Casey; **Sweet Briar College**, Jovan De Rocco, G. Noble Gilpin, Roscislaw M. Iwanowski, Kenneth G. Weihe; **Syracuse University**, Arthur W. Brown, Vincent J. Glennon, John D. Hall, Arthur E. Jones, Jr., Richard C. Lonsdale, Maude A. Stewart, Betty M. Watts, Karl Wernert; **Temple University**, Stephen Abrahamson, John F. Adams, Purnell Benson, Frederick M. Binder, Clifford Brenner, Edwin B. Bronner, Irwin Brown, Josephine H. England, Rita A. Ficchi, Jacob W. Gruber, Leo Jason, Stanford S. Kight, Robert H. Llewellyn, Howard Meroney, Irene Morris, Paul E. Randall, Richard J. Restrepo, Elaine C. Sturm, Robert G. Thompson, Harry M. Tinkcom, Joe Zimmermann; **Middle Tennessee State College**, Philip H. Dalton, Eugene Wiggins; **University of Tennessee**, Robert S. Avery, William J. Hudson, Arthur B. Wood; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, Bob M. Gallaway; **Texas College of Arts and Industries**, James H. McCrocklin, Leslie L. Melbern; **Texas State College for Women**, Mona V. Harding; **East Texas State Teachers College**, Robert E. Baker, Leslie D. Keaton, Gertrude Warmack; **North Texas State Teachers College**, Albert B. Short; **Southwest Texas State Teachers College**, Mary L. Hightower; **Texas State University for Negroes**, Joseph J. Abernethy, Thelma O. Bell, David Bradford, Elizabeth W. Bradley, Mamie J. Broussard, Lawrence H. Cook, William H. Cook, Matthew N. Cooper, Charles W. Deslandes, Edward B. Evans, Jr., Jeannette L. Fonsworth, Venetta B. C. Foreman, Eliza M. D. George, Josephine Giles, Henry C. Grant, Frederick Griffin, Andrew J. Kennard, E. W. Kyle, Cecelia S. Lane, Oliver Lattimore, Willard C. McCleary, Hazel L. Morton, Robinson H. Parson, James O. Perry, Clarice E. Pierson, Raleigh P. Player, William H. Porter, Jayne G. Robinson, Lillian P. Samuels, Anna G. Scott, Ollington E. Smith, Elneita W. Stewart, Vernice L. Stewart, Bennie E. Taylor, Joseph A. Taylor, Minnie L. Turner, J. Marie Van Zandt, Peyton E. Walton, Jr., Rosalie O. Whitmore; **Texas Technological College**, Theodore W. Alexander, Neva R. Gahring, Fay Hattox, William Raffaniello; **University of Texas**, John H. Barr, Jacqueline T. Courtney, Durward H. Dyche, Mary L. Harwood, Wilson M. Hudson, Jr., Vernon E. Lynch, James L. McCary, Gordon Minter, Donald Robertson, Carey C. Thompson; **University of Toledo**, Frank J. Marquis; **Tufts College**, George B. Burch; **Tulane University**, George H. Bick, Fred C. Cole, James K. Feibleman, Herbert D. Friedlander, William J. Griffith, Jack F. Harang, William A. Jenkins, Jr., Dan W. Mullin, David A. Shirley, Frank H. Wood; **United States Naval Academy**, John R. Clark; **United States Naval Postgraduate School**, David B. Hoisington, Earl Kanter, M. Curtis Smith; **Upsala College**, Alfred E. Bray, Gerald Davidson, Penelope Dimitriou, Carl Fjellman, Gladys Grindeland, Miriam Grosh, Donald Heines, L. Dale Lund, Kaethe Mengelberg, Ilia Mourontseff, Gaspard Pinette, John A. Rabb, Robert M. Reed, Friedrich Roetter, August Saenger, Vernon E. Swanson; **Utah State Agricultural College**, Hugh A. Buntine, John C. Carlisle, Don C. Carter, Joseph Coulam, J. L. Francisco, E. L. Romney, J. Kenneth Vanderhoff; **University of Utah**, Eldon J. Gardner,

Albert W. Grundmann, Clarence R. Wylie; Villanova College, Jerome J. Fischer; Medical College of Virginia, Leslie E. Edwards, Walther Riese, Helen Skowlund, Washington C. Winn; Virginia Union University, Edward D. McCreary, Jr.; Wabash College, Frank D. Horvay, Joseph Zeleniak; Washington College, Charles B. Clark, John S. Smith; Eastern Washington College of Education, Christine Elrod, Dorine Guthrie, Raymond Krebsbach, Bertha T. Lincoln, Mary E. Miles, Gladys O. Philpott, Arne W. Randall, Goldie M. Taylor, Robert M. Trotter; Washington and Jefferson College, Henry P. Bennet, Donald W. Bradeen, Leonard W. Kirby, Julius Kraft, John S. Lindsay, A. Richard Oliver, Francis Wing; Washington State College, Donald Greenaway, L. Arthur Jenkins; Washington University, Norman J. DeWitt, John H. Ernest, Winfred P. Lehmann, Wolfgang J. Thron; University of Washington, Herbert L. Anshutz, Theodore J. Barnowe, Paul A. Bonifas, Wendell Brazeau, A. Evelyn Burke, Harry H. Burns, Carroll A. Burroughs, Gordon P. Campbell, Philip W. Cartwright, Joseph Cohen, Emmett E. Day, Robert H. Dietz, William W. Elmendorf, Michael Guidon III, Markham Harris, Mercedes H. Hensley, H. K. Hossom, John H. Jessup, Pauline Johnson, Roger B. Loucks, Frank S. Melder, Blake D. Mills, Jr., Omer L. Mithun, James B. Morrison, Charles W. Newman, William B. Nordquist, Warren W. Philbrick, Garth L. Putnam, Charles E. Rossbach, George A. Shipman, Dell Skeels, William A. Snyder, Victor C. Strash, Howard E. Sylvester, E. Ayers Taylor, Berenice Thorpe, Elgin Williams, Leota S. Willis, A. M. Winslow, Elinor Yaggy; Wayne University, Viola Dunbar, Selma Guttman, Leo Kirschbaum, Gafia Millard, Bèla de Tuscon, William White; Wellesley College, Walter E. Houghton; Wesleyan College, Frances G. Candler; Wesleyan University, Morton W. Briggs, William Frost, Victor Jones, John W. Sease, Calvin W. Tenney; West Liberty State College, Joseph A. Bartell, Marion M. Lamb, Kenneth B. McMillen, Ruth W. Vest; West Virginia University, Lillian Allen, W. A. Kochler, William R. Ross; Western Reserve University, Edith E. Layer, Dwight W. Miles; Westminster College (Missouri), William T. Doherty, Jr., Kenneth H. Hansen; Wheelock College, S. Wilcox Harvey; Whittier College, Peter F. Palmer; University of Wichita, Harry C. Mahan, Herbert A. Shumway, Lillie Zimmerman; Wilberforce University, Leon M. Elam, Leslie R. Nallen; College of William and Mary, Michael E. Adelstein, Robert M. Myers; College of William and Mary (Norfolk Division), Lotte Barschak, George A. Beebe, Albert E. Taylor; Williams College, Charles D. Cremeans, Emile Despres, William B. Gates, Jr., Robert C. Goodell, Chandler Morse; Wilson College, Clara C. Cooper, Elisabeth R. Swain; Wisconsin State Teachers College (La Crosse), Floyd O. Atchley; Wisconsin State Teachers College (Milwaukee), Godfrey D. Stevens; Wisconsin State Teachers College (River Falls), Lura M. Carrithers, J. Knowles Robbins; University of Wisconsin, Ray U. Brumblay, Paul G. Jones, Durward C. Layde, James D. Thompson; Wittenberg College, Minnie B. Tracey, Harry S. Wilder; University of Wyoming, Richard M. Renfro; Yankton College, Shapleigh W. Howell, Juul E. van Regteren Altena.

Junior

Catholic University of America, Richard A. Finnegan; University of Colorado, Stephen V. Ballou, L. E. Belstrom; Columbia University, Anthony J. Klancar; Southern Illinois University, Robert E. Collard, José L. Reyes-Navarro; University of Illinois, Lois T. Hartley, Effie N. Hunt; University of Illinois (Navy Pier), Herbert L. Berman; Indiana University, Robert F. Volland; Iowa State College, Robert N. Goss, William W. Pratt; Iowa State University, Charles W. Philhour; University of Kansas, Marko L. Haggard; Lincoln Memorial University, Ann B. Frank; University of Michigan, Richard D. Miles; Eastern Montana State Normal School, Milton E. Johnson; University of Notre Dame, Robert G. Brown; Ohio State University, Robert P. Bullock, Marvin R. Koller, Herman Lantz, Morton deC. Nachlas; Pennsylvania State College, William R. Brandon; Rutgers University, Muriel De Rose; Vanderbilt University, Edwin Larson; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, Edward Blackman (Ph.D., Harvard University), Grove Hall, Massachusetts; Charles H. Eberly (Graduate Student, Yale University), Guilford, Connecticut; Heinz Schwaneger (M.A., University of Pennsylvania), Collingswood, New Jersey.

Members Elected

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election of 1962 Active and 41 Junior Members as follows:

Active

University of Akron, James M. McLain, Frank L. Simonetti, Harold E. Smith; Alabama Polytechnic Institute, David N. Bottoms, William H. Coppedge, Mary H. Dodson, James F. Dolson, Robert L. Ferrell, Vernon K. Gunkel, James E. Land, Claude McNorton, Wilmot G. Rhodes, Eloise Seay, Frank J. Stevens, Wathena Temple; Alabama State Teachers College (Jacksonville), Miriam B. Fisher, Mildred B. Johnson, Lawrence Miles, Horace L. Stevenson; University of Alaska, Richard H. Byrns, Bert E. Griffin, Richard V. Jackson, Gordon B. Jacobs, Mary L. Lambie, Raymond L. Smith, William S. Wilson; Albion College, Vernon L. Bobbitt, Elsie B. Silkworth; Allegheny College, Herbert Neurath; Amherst College, Sterling P. Lamprecht, James A. Martin, Jr., David Todd; Arizona State College (Flagstaff), John E. Severson; Arizona State College (Tempe), Gerald R. Fuller, Walter S. Hertzog, Edith B. Pilcher, George L. Sheppard; University of Arizona, Bernard R. Breyer, Anne Gruenwald; University of Arkansas, Ragnar Austad, Edward Crook, Dillon O. Darby, Earl E. Ditmars, Joseph P. Fulton, Wladimir W. Grigorieff, Harold M. Hefley, Stacy L. Hull, Clarence A. Moore, Tom G. Secoy, Thomas W. Smith, John W. White, Norris Yates; Atlanta University, Thomas D. Jarrett; Baldwin-Wallace College, Helen E. Reynolds; Ball State Teachers College, Mary Beeman, Vernal H. Carmichael, Arnim D. Hummel,

Bernard R. Josif, Forrest L. Mayer, Proctor W. Maynard, Alan R. Pawelek, Theresa Schermer, William P. Swettman; **Baylor University**, Roy F. Butler; **Beloit College**, Joseph A. Kahl, Frederick J. Mathews, M. C. Morris, Arthur O. Seltzer, Kathryn Wilson; **Berea College**, William J. Foley, Minnie Ledford, Bonnie Oden, D. B. Robertson; **Bluefield State College**, Vivian K. Cameron, Edwin M. Ferrell, Askew A. Lawrence, Irene E. Moats, Joseph A. Walker; **Boston University**, Bernardo Gicovate, Elmer W. Salenius, Arthur J. Watzinger, Jules Wolfers; **Bowling Green State University**, Philip A. Kint, James B. McQuown, William S. Wagner; **Bradley University**, Bernard H. Hargrove; **University of British Columbia**, G. P. V. Akrigg, Barnett Savery; **Brooklyn College**, Walter Cerf, Natalie T. Darcy, Albert N. Guthrie, Ernest M. Livingston, Sonia Wachstein; **Brown University**, Franklin O. Rose; **Bucknell University**, Gladys E. Cook, Harold E. Cook, Lydia Holm, Mildred Martin, Robert Rautenstrauch; **University of Buffalo**, Mabel D. Montgomery; **Butler University**, Martin Allen, Harold Balzer, Edwin B. Bell, Abram E. Cory, Harry E. Crull, Louise Dauner, Mabel M. Esten, Vergil E. Hiatt, Arthur Holmes, William L. Howard, Colette M. Hurley, Lorle Krull, Helen H. McTurnan, Desmond Murphy, Walter Myers, Jr., Mary S. Owen, C. Elizabeth Phillips, Rebecca E. Pitts, Arthur W. Reid, Mary J. B. Schneider, James M. Smith, Mary E. Smith, S. Marion Smith, Blair W. Sparks, Emma L. Thornbrough, Muriel J. Tucker, Robert H. VanCleave, Donald R. Wittig; **California Institute of Technology**, Gilbert D. McCann; **University of California**, Delmer M. Brown, Erasmo Buceta, Robert E. Connick, William F. Giauque, Ralph Hultgren, Louis Jacobson, George V. Lantzeff, Choh-Hao Li, Roy Overstreet, Frank M. Russell, David Rynin, Harry R. Wellman; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, Walter R. Goldschmidt, Martin R. Huberty, Morris V. Jones, Norman P. Miller, Morris Neuburger, Wesley L. Orr, Bernard O. Phinney, Lincoln Smith; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, George L. Bach, Clara J. Douglas, Martha P. Eggers, Francis W. Hoyer, James B. Klee, Louis Sacks; **Carroll College**, Russell K. Bowman, John W. Breen, Joseph E. Runkel, Jacob VanTuinen; **Carthage College**, James J. Nehez; **Case Institute of Technology**, Delmar W. Anderson, E. Leonard Arnoff, Charles S. Bacon, Jr., Richard G. Bauman, John E. Darraugh, Robert Y. Dean, William F. Downey, Archie W. Fay, Harold Fleisher, Bryant M. French, Robert P. Knupke, Harry R. Kyr, Claude B. McIntosh, Harry Nara, Gilbert A. Nyerges, Edward W. Oberzil, James T. Owen, Francis D. Parker, Edward G. Rapp, William E. Rees, Ray A. Ride, John B. Scalzi, Charles Schaefer, Claude B. Sharer, John R. Valley, Thomas J. Walsh, Richard E. Whitehart, John A. Wilson, William F. Zornow; **Catholic University of America**, Ralph F. Baldwin, Anne McNamara, Aida Mastrangelo, M. Dominic Ramacciotti; **Cedar Crest College**, Kate Clugston, Chester C. Connell, Clayton W. Wotring; **University of Chattanooga**, Roland D. Carter, Norbert Koch, Bradford K. MacGaw, Robert A. Merrill, Curtis C. Page, Karl G. Regnolds, Elmo M. Roberds, Jr., Howard Sutton, Dorothy H. Ward; **University of Chicago**, S. William Halperin, John

Wilkinson; **University of Cincinnati**, Campbell Crockett, William H. Hawley, Harry D. Heyboer, James E. King, Lloyd W. Krogh, Eric H. Wang; **The City College (New York)**, Harold J. Carter, Bertram Epstein, J. Bailey Harvey, Charles Roth; **Clark University**, J. Fannin King; **Clemson Agricultural College**, Douglas W. Bradbury, Floyd I. Brownley, Jr., Peter Carodemos, H. Morris Cox, G. Durden, D. George H. Edwards, Herman M. Felder, Jr., Edwin J. Freeman, Albert H. Holt, Julius C. Hubbard, Jr., Hugh H. McGarity, Carl M. McHugh, Henry T. Polk, Dan P. Thomson, John B. Whitney, Jr., Jack K. Williams, Harold B. Wilson; **Coe College**, Signi Falk, Paul A. Graber, Lester B. McAllister, Jr., Edgar W. Voelker, Fenton J. Wolfe; **Colgate University**, Donald B. Korb; **Colorado College**, Louise F. Kampf; **University of Colorado**, Robert G. Athearn, Dennis L. Barrick, John W. Berry, Donald E. Billings, Howard W. Boehmer, John M. Cleveland, Berton Coffin, Willard L. Erickson, Harold C. Heim, James M. Jackson, William F. Jemison, Joan LeFant, Eleanor I. Lindstrom, William W. Main, Pauline Marshall, Alden F. Megrew, Frederic A. Pruett, Warren Raeder, Francis C. Robinson, Edward L. Rose, W. M. Spackman, Peggie W. Wiegand; **Western State College of Colorado**, C. Earle Hoshall, Judd Kline, George L. Nuckolls, Greta D. Slack; **Columbia University**, Maurice F. Tauber; **Concord College**, Louis W. Alrutz, James B. Callaghan, William B. Caruth, Russell M. Falt, Ermon N. Foster, Louise S. Lovell, Marietta W. McNeer, Rafael F. Muraca, Ruby M. Phillips, Harry B. Streb; **Connecticut College**, Ann Very; **University of Connecticut (Fort Trumbull Branch)**, Robert W. Adamson, Arthur E. Anderson, Charles T. Berry, James L. Cummings, Thomas J. Cusick, Paul J. DeSio, Charles A. Fritz, Jr., Geraldine Gallagher, Stanley Grean, Elmer W. Heller, Bradley T. Perry, Klasine Semmler, Ludwik S. Sikorski, Frances Tannenbaum, Betty Torell, Rudolph Treo, Graydon C. Wagner, Abraham Wilensky, Jeanne F. Williams; **Cooper Union**, Richard S. Bowman, James N. Eastham, Louis M. Heil, Henry B. Hope, Herbert Liebeskind, Harold Nörse, Herbert F. Roemmele, Clarence S. Sherman, Ernest W. Starr, Arthur Startz, Harold A. Wren; **Cornell College**, Robert V. Smith; **Cornell University**, William C. Andrae, William C. Ballard, Jr., C. Kenneth Beach, Arthur B. Burrell, John A. Clausen, James W. Hall, Maynard F. Moseley, Jr., Walter L. Nelson, Eunice Raimon, Edward A. Suchman, N. Arnold Tolles; **Culver-Stockton College**, John B. Alexander; **Dartmouth College**, William P. Kimball, Robert A. McKennan, Thomas H. Vance, Donald T. Wood; **University of Dayton**, William D. Ross; **Denison University**, Robert W. John; **University of Denver**, Edward U. Bourke, Olna Fant, Jack R. Finley, A. M. I. Fiskin, Aylesa Forsee, Margaret Hayes, Eleanor Luette, Robert L. McKee, Kenneth L. Noble, Elizabeth L. Porcher, Roy H. Saunders, Eugene D. Sternberg, Richard G. Stone, Marcus R. Tool; **DePauw University**, Glenn Olds, Jr.; **Drake University**, Boris G. Alexander, Alvin Brodish, Jack P. Donis; **Drury College**, Sam C. Bayless, Mary E. Hinkley; **Duke University**, Margaret C. Ward, Joseph C. Wetherby; **Elmira College**, Marjorie C. Bradford; **Evansville College**, Leland W. Moon; **Fisk**

University, Lloyd E. Alexander, Julian Bell, St. Elmo Brady, Lyman V. Cady, Arthur R. Croley, Aaron Douglas, Harry T. Folger, Gladys I. Forde, Ellen F. Greene, Herbert M. Holloway, Blyden Jackson, Henderson A. Johnson, Emmett G. Kellogg, Emilio A. Lanier, John F. Ohl, Beryl Parker, Lee O. Scott, Lois Towles, Preston Valien, Lillian W. Voorhees, Wilson Q. Welch, Donald W. Wyatt; **Florida State University**, J. Benjamin Beyrer, William F. Blaylock, William H. Boughton, Rachel E. Bryant, Milton R. Charles, Charles L. Clapp, Jr., Lois L. Goldman, Edgar H. Henderson, Laura Jepsen, Natalie K. Johnson, Robert H. Kessner, Thomas R. Lias, Mary A. Magginis, Hugh E. Murphy, Edward Newman, Elston E. Roady, Vera L. Ryder, Theodore D. Slocum; **University of Florida**, Hazel L. Bowman, Ernest C. Collins, Robert E. L. Greene, Johann J. Hinrichs, Herschel W. Little, George J. Miller, William J. Murray, Leroy Patterson, Henry C. Seestedt, William B. Steis, Morris B. Storer, Sidney Warren, Arthur J. Waterman, Jr.; **Franklin and Marshall College**, Horace F. Dantro, Ivan W. LeFevre, William A. Thomson, Ezequiel A. Vieta; **Fresno State College**, Russell M. Bate, William C. Beatty, Jr., Marion E. Bigelow, Arthur J. Bryon, Chester F. Cole, W. J. Dunning, Herman D. Graham, Ellen B. Herndon, Mabel Hupprich, Marvelle Hutchison, Virgil L. Matthew, Jr., Bryant E. Rees, Andrew D. Rippey, Ethel A. Robinson, Helen Shafer, Donald K. Winslow; **Furman University**, James W. Moffitt, Charles L. Rasor, Robert C. Tucker; **George Washington University**, Reuben E. Wood; **Georgetown University**, Jesse A. Mann, P. Francis Wilson; **Middle Georgia College**, Lee W. Stebbings; **Georgia Institute of Technology**, James V. Dillard, Kenneth M. England, Theodore M. Hart, Alton A. Hobgood, Wilfred M. Honour, James MacDonald, Jr., Bernard J. Myers, Redding S. Sugg, Jr.; **Georgia State Woman's College**, Corinne S. Knight; **University of Georgia**, Homer A. Black; **Goucher College**, Josephine Fiske; **Grove City College**, Rea G. Walters; **Gustavus Adolphus College**, Gerhard T. Alexis, Helen A. Bergman, George W. Forell, Florence M. Fredricksen, Donald R. Fryxell; **Hahnemann Medical College**, Horst A. Agerty, Thomas C. Barnes, Joseph S. Hepburn, Alexander E. Pearce; **Hamilton College**, Winthrop Bellamy, Donald S. Dunbar, Frank R. Olson; **Harris Teachers College**, Julia K. Murray; **Harvard University**, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Harold L. Weatherford; **University of Hawaii**, Pauline Heizer, Leo Kartman, Lloyd L. Lee; **Hofstra College**, Harold W. Arberg, Susanne Giliberti, Janet R. Kahan, B. George Sieg, Robert W. Stewart; **College of the Holy Cross**, Francis A. Drumm; **Hood College**, Geneva F. Ely, Martha M. Reddick, Kathryn Royer, Edwin H. Sponseller; **Howard University**, Roger D. Russell, S. Herbert Unterberger; **Hunter College**, John P. Clay, Rose T. Clough, LaWanda Cox, Henry Dupont, Gertrude Gottschall, Margaret R. Grennan, N. Jean Novello; **Idaho State College**, B. A. de Vere Bailey, Clark S. Carlile, Robert K. Charlesworth, D. S. Guha, Andrei L. Isotoff, Hazel Powell; **University of Idaho**, Robert T. Drake; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, Roland A. Budenholzer, Donald W. Calhoun, George F. Levy, Mentor L. Williams; **Eastern Illinois State College**, Florence McAfee, Lester R. Van Deventer; **Western Illinois**

State College, Tressie Bonham, H. Waldo Horrabin, Florence Hulett, Virginia Lowell, Eleanor F. Matthews, Nancy D. Neeley, Olive E. Potter, June Seebree, Paul B. Swain, Loren E. Taylor, Norman R. Urquhart, Wayne Wetzel; Illinois State Normal University, Byron K. Barton; Northern Illinois State Teachers College, Marjorie Baumgarten, Frederick W. Rolf, Mary B. Swynehardt; Southern Illinois University, Joseph R. Baxter, Ledford J. Bischof, G. C. Camp, Cameron W. Garbutt, William B. Schneider; University of Illinois, George S. Amsbary, Esther W. Anell, Bernard J. Babler, Marcia B. Bowman, Alice L. Boyd, Gerald D. Brighton, Fannie M. Brooks, Ida B. Bruner, Gladys R. Bucher, William L. Burlison, Andrew M. Carter, J. G. Cash, Margaret K. Chandler, Abraham Charnes, William T. Davis, Otto A. Dieter, Bernard J. Diggs, Ralph E. Eckerstrom, Arnold L. Fellows, Alfred M. Freudenthal, Oliver F. Gaebe, Phillips L. Garman, Maxwell R. Garret, Anna C. Glover, Margaret Goodyear, John A. Henry, Dorothy J. Iwig Ruth, T. Krouse, Mary S. Ligon, Dorothy Litherland, Ernest M. Lyman, J. Victor Mansfield, Edith M. Marshall, Eunice M. Moore, Martin L. Mosher, Rudolph Odén, Arthur D. Pickett, Edwin I. Pilchard, Henry Quastler, Anna Searl, David Shakow, Thomas C. Shedd, H. J. Snider, Earl P. Strong, Frank M. Stubblefield, Alfred U. Thor, Joseph T. Tykociner, Nelson D. Wakefield, Gladys J. Ward, Allen S. Weller, Olin L. Whalin, George C. Wickwire; University of Illinois (Galesburg Division), Alvin W. Ahrens, Ann Bromley, Margaret Brooks, Theodore W. Charlwood, H. Kelly Crockett, J. Lester Dalton, Mary L. Donohue, Edna L. Drury, Omar C. Estes, Helen H. Fesler, Hubert Geyer, Roland Gibson, Gordon R. Glabe, Romain G. Greene, Jane Grubgeld, Emilie V. Haynsworth, Andrew J. Horn, Jr., Paul Hubbard, Roy Huitema, Clarence H. Jackman, G. Edward Jones, William A. Lafferty, Carl A. Leuthold, Clarence I. McSwane, Harvey Mullen, Dorothy Odell, Genevieve O'Haven, Clarence J. Perry, Willis L. Pickard, Elizabeth J. Pretzer, Francis E. Pratt, Ralph W. Raymond, F. George Schrantz, Robert W. Thornton, Harold J. Warren, June B. Wylie; Indiana University, Agnes Anderson, Paul Bergevin, Ritchie G. Davis, William H. Fox, Monrad G. Paulsen, Walter Robert, Franklin M. Schultz; Iowa State College, Forest C. Dana, Lyell D. Henry, Norma R. Hollen, Erling N. Jensen, James P. Michalos, Louis E. Pinney, Marion B. Richardson, Elizabeth T. Sheerer; Iowa State Teachers College, Kenneth E. Anderson, Richard L. Beard, Anita L. Dowler, Merrill F. Fink, Ernest C. Fossum, Josef W. Fox, Alden B. Hanson, Harald B. Holst, Karl M. Holvik, Harry W. Holzhauer, Thomas D. Horn, George L. Keppers, William P. Latham, John W. Mitchell, Daryl Pendergraft, Donald R. Scott, Nancy Snider, Norman C. Stageberg, Evelyn F. Starkey, Robert E. Strain, Willis H. Wagner, Shirley Winsberg; State University of Iowa, Humbert Albrizio, James H. Allen, Dudley Ashton, Homer J. Avery, Arthur M. Barnes, Julian D. Boyd, Edgar S. Brintnall, Philip W. Burton, Robert G. Carney, Frank E. Coburn, Carroll Coleman, Stuart Edie, Lawrence O. Ely, Johann L. Ehrenhaft, John A. Ford, Shirley Hammond, Robert C. Hardin, William Huffman, Paul E. Huston, Robert L. Jackson, Lewis January, Marion Jones,

William C. Keettel, Elizabeth L. Knapp, Clair M. Kos, Mauricio Lasansky, James Lechay, Placidus J. Leinfelder, E. F. Lindquist, Lester D. Longman, Hal Lotterman, Kenneth MacDonald, Margaret Meigs, Clark H. Millikan, Malcolm H. Myers, Stephen F. Nagyfy, Ruben Nomland, Delmar L. Nordquist, Marcus P. Powell, Helen G. Price, J. H. Randall, Scott N. Reger, Roland Rooks, M. Gladys Scott, Wilma K. Smith, Mabel I. Snedaker, Jean Stanicek, Genevieve Stearns, Robert J. Stein, Robert T. Tidrick, Glenn L. Walker, Sidney E. Ziffren; **Iowa Wesleyan College**, Harold W. Matzke; **James Millikin University**, Morris Bench, Edith M. Brainard, Bryce K. Brown, Claude D. Dicks, Margaret V. Frahm, L. James Hess, Merle C. Lewey, Reginald H. Neal, William L. Olsen, Jr., Ethel M. Parkinson, Nellie Jo Sager, D. Richard Smith, Glen R. Smith, Jarold D. Talbot, Elizabeth Weatherford, Frances E. Wilson; **John B. Stetson University**, Howard L. Bateson; **Johns Hopkins University**, Charles R. Anderson, J. D. H. Donnay, Anna G. Hatcher, Arno C. Schirokauer, Leo Spitzer; **Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science**, Allen D. Miller, Oscar W. Tollefson; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, William A. Black, Martha Koppius; **University of Kansas**, Harold E. Addington, Michael F. Andrews, Edward K. Blakeney, Dessa J. Bush, Natalie Calderwood, J. Sheldon Carey, Irene E. Cebula, Jack Chernick, Jan Chiapusso, Terrel E. Clarke, Gerald V. Davis, Vida Dunbar, Edwin R. Elbel, Maude Ellsworth, A. Bruce Etherington, Clayton V. Fowler, Robert B. Green, Nancie B. Greenman, Adah C. Hagen, Donald D. Haines, Helen E. Hayden, Gladys Hendricks, Connie Herrera, Ruth I. Hoover, Edwin D. Hunter, Arvid D. Jacobson, J. O. Jones, Elin K. Jorgensen, William A. Knoke, Mitchell Korzenovsky, Lottie Lesh, Reid B. Lyford, Jr., Paul M. McCollum, Ruth M. McMahon, James C. Malin, W. Thomas Marrocco, Theodore G. Metcalf, Meribah Moore, J. D. Morgan, Mignon Morton, Katherine Mulky, Loda Newcomb, Helen Nigh, Beth W. Noble, Ray E. Ottinger, Jr., Irene Peabody, Charles G. Pearson, E. B. Phillips, Oakley Pittman, W. W. Richardson, Leslie B. Robertson, Howard Rust, Vivian R. Scoggin, Elaine Selicovitz, Henry A. Shenk, Richard B. Sheridan, Carlyle H. Smith, Erma Smith, Spencer M. Smith, Joie L. Stapleton, Jeanette C. Stough, Reginald R. Strait, Robert N. Sudlow, Alice V. Swenson, Erhard Thiel, Janet C. Turk, Marjorie Whitney, Russel L. Wiley, Lloyd C. Wilson; **University of Kansas City**, Rolland M. Bristol, E. Parker Dupler, Hazel Graves, Curt Gruneberg, Hans von Hentig, E. Melba Johnson, Anna M. Kruse, Joseph J. Leon; **Kent State University**, Dorcas J. Anderson, Emma Carroll, J. Cleve Carroll, Evelyn Davidson, Frederick E. Davidson, John R. Hipple, Harold E. Lionetti, Harold H. Loudin, Hazel Messimore, Charles Omer, Albert Pamies, Mary J. Rehder, Eunice E. Saxe, Will S. Thompson; **University of Kentucky**, R. S. Allen, Hager W. Bach, Ralph Bergamo, Ben W. Black, John H. Bondurant, Lawrence A. Bradford, George K. Brady, William R. Brown, Ernest A. Bureau, James S. Calvin, Willis M. Carter, William S. Connor, Frank G. Dickey, James M. Edney, Ogden F. Edwards, Frank J. Essene, Gordon C. Godbey, Robert G. Godfrey, William G. Haag,

Richard Hanau, Mary M. Hardin, David L. Hatch, Clinton K. Hoffmann, John L. Hoover, John S. Horine, Margaret B. Humphreys, James C. Humphries, Bernard M. Johnson, L. M. Josephson, Milo G. Karsner, Albert D. Kirwan, J. Ardery McCauley, William E. McCubbin, Ruth McQuown, William L. Matthews, Jr., Samuel A. Mory, Jr., Marjorie Murray, Joe K. Neel, William D. Nicholls, Robert Niederhoffer, F. Lewis Orrell, Jr., Charles A. Povlovich, Jr., David A. Reid, H. Alex Romanowitz, Alice K. Rucker, Ida M. Scharfschwerdt, Don C. Seaton, Frances Seeds, Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., William D. Stout, Hambleton Tapp, W. S. Ward, James R. Woodall; **Keuka College**, Dorothy P. Felt; **Knox College**, Elna L. Jeffries, Werner E. E. Klimpt; **Lafayette College**, Ernest A. Buchner, Harry F. Garner, Albert W. Gendebien, Sal P. Gimelli, Karl D. Larsen, Basil McCabe, Elliott L. McMillen, Bedford Thurman, Dale L. Van Meter, Arthur R. Winters, Stephen Wray, Jr.; **Lehigh University**, Jesse V. Burkhead; **Lincoln Memorial University**, Louis Lutz; **Lincoln University (Missouri)**, Lila Hobson, Hortense D. Holloway, David D. Rains, Lucille S. Welch; **Lindenwood College**, Marguerite T. Ahrens, Grace G. Albrecht, Hugo J. Bauer, Lois M. Burkitt, Raymond L. Garnett, Carolyn S. Gray, Kathryn Hankins, Elizabeth Isaacs, Lois Karr, Margaret S. Mitzit, Ilse E. Nelson, William W. Parkinson, Dorothy H. Ross, Agnes Sibley, Lillian W. Swanson, John Thomas, Marguerite L. Ver Kruzen, Elisabeth M. Watts, Anna Wurster; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana**, Carolyn E. Bock; **University of Louisville**, Charles M. Beard, Paul H. Bowman, Kathleen Drummond, William F. Ekstrom, Susie M. E. Nelson, Virginia J. Rock; **Loyola University (Illinois)**, Essie Anglum, John I. Bettenbender, Robert G. Connors, Edward A. Dwyer, John E. Dwyer, Lorraine Jung, Peter T. Kapsalis, Robert J. Kreyche, Richard A. Matré, Kate E. Meehan, Robert Meier, Jerome T. O'Grady, Joseph A. O'Leary, Roger P. Parr, John J. Riordan, J. L. Rosenstein, Walter J. Smith, William D. Wilkins, Frances Young; **Lycoming College**, Clarence R. Athearn, Roger Cogswell, Cretyl I. Crumb, J. Milnor Dorey, John P. Graham, Harold I. Hinkelman, Eloise B. Mallinson, James M. Skeath, Robert F. Smith, Virginia L. Smith, James W. Sterling, Clair J. Switzer; **Lynchburg College**, Grover W. Everett, Ben W. Fusion, Delphine Giers, Joseph B. Hunter, Irving E. Mitchell, Raymond E. Morgan, Shirley E. Rosser, Richard F. Stone, M. Weldon Thompson, Mary L. Weise, Alice Zimmerman; **Macalester College**, Kenneth A. Millard; **Madison College**, Stephen C. Bocskey; **University of Maine**, Erwin E. Detweiler, Therese I. Dumais, Paul M. Glaude, Richard C. Hill, William H. Jeffrey, John W. Jones, Walter W. Leach, Carl E. Otto, John Ryan, Andrew L. Sopchak, Norman V. Suarez, Frank H. Todd, Fern Y. Witham, Walter H. Witham; **Manhattan College**, Paschal Cantatore; **Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart**, Katherine Alexeieff, Aimée C. Bourneuf, Cora Brady, Gertrude V. Brady, Mary Byles, Loretta M. Corcoran, Elizabeth H. Farley, Margaret M. McShane, Catherine E. Maguire, Helen Moclair, Josephine D. Morgan, Dorothy M. Parton, Margaret Rogers, Julia Sampson, Kathryn Sullivan, Mary B. Tenney, Anne O. Todd, Margaret Williams; **Marshall**

College, Chester E. Ball, Henrietta Hepburn, Frieda Starkey; **University of Maryland**, Charles F. Cronin, Joseph G. Dubuque, Elizabeth Flinchbaugh, George J. Kabat, Robert T. Mann, Herman Maril, Jane V. Moriarty, Graciela P. Nemes, Lenora C. Rosenfield, Melvin R. White, June C. Wilbur; **University of Massachusetts (Fort Devens)**, Barbara Calhoun, George J. Oberlander; **Meharry Medical College**, Emma L. White; **University of Miami**, Dorothy C. Andrews, Daniel D. Ashkenas, Reuben Y. Ellison, George L. Fahey, Arturo di Filippi, Carlos S. Kakouris, Marvin V. McCormick, Murray Mantell, Grace Morrison, Gregorio B. Palacin, Willis E. Smith, Gloria de la Vega, Frank D. Venning, Ruby Warner; **Michigan College of Mining and Technology**, C. George Stipe; **Michigan State College**, Elbert S. Churchill, Clyde W. Dow, Mary Frang, John A. Garraty, Roger B. Hamlin, Margaret C. Hearn, Jean Hemphill, Frederick R. Howe, Marjorie Knoll, Lewis B. Mayhew, Nicholas Musselman, C. Winston Osborn, Ira Polley, Marian Purcell, Philip H. Ragan, Randall C. Ruechelle, Robert D. Schuetz, Harold E. Sponberg, Kenneth G. Stone, Jr., Dorothy C. Washburn, Ernst V. Wolff; **Michigan State Normal College**, Harry De Vries; **University of Michigan**, Jack E. Bender, Hayden K. Carruth, Louis Granich, Rensis Likert, Loren LaM. Okey, Thomas M. Sawyer, Jr., Edward L. Walker, Philip R. Wikelund; **Middlebury College**, Manuel Alvarez-Morales, Walter H. Clark, Robert L. Harris, Leonore J. Johnson, Lockwood Merriman, Lewis W. Miller, J. Laurence Phalan, Harris E. Thurber; **Mills College**, June Brasted, Helen R. Demsey, Luis Monguió, Marie Nogues, Olga Schnitzler, Ilse Schulz; **Milwaukee-Downer College**, Otilie R. Inman; **Minnesota State Teachers College (Winona)**, Augusta C. Nelson; **University of Minnesota**, C. Harold Stone; **University of Minnesota (Duluth Branch)**, Palmer A. Graver, Carroll B. Hanson, James F. Maclear, Valworth R. Plumb, Millard C. Walker, Clara Wiltse; **Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy**, Charles A. Johnson; **Central Missouri State College**, Ben R. Craig, Mary E. Foley, Irene Freeman, Louise Martin, Laura J. Nahm, George Nightingale; **Southwest Missouri State College**, Estle Funkhauser, Esther M. Hennicke, Henrietta Keller, Mabel Moberly, James H. Skelton, Myrtle P. Teter, Wiley F. Woodring; **Northwest Missouri State Teachers College**, Clifford L. Bishop, Helen I. Johnson, Mary E. Keith, Catherine M. Phelps, John L. Smay, John S. Taylor; **University of Missouri**, Robert H. Frost, Mildred E. Johnson, George W. Senteney; **Missouri Valley College**, Jane M. Allaman, J. Marshall Baker, Byron B. Banta, Charles W. Gehrke, Esther L. Liffing, Lawrence C. Thomas; **Monmouth College**, Gregory Falls, Carl W. Gamer, Ruth F. Mitchell; **Eastern Montana State Normal School**, Oscar M. Bjorgum, Keith Manion, Pauline H. Rich; **Montana State College**, John W. Blankenhorn, Laurence W. Cor, Eldon R. Dodge, Paul A. Grieder, Lesley M. Heathcote, Nicholas Helburn, Roy E. Huffman, Loyd J. Hultgren, Carl F. Kraenzel, Thelma L. Laird, Gene F. Payne, Halver M. Skinner, Arthur McE. Smith, Donald W. Trueblood, Ray Wissler; **Montana State University**, Charles S. Hatton, Robert G. Huck, Wayne R. Lowell, Carl L. Sullenberger; **Morgan State College**, C. Philip

Butcher, Thomas P. Fraser, Juanita G. Starke, Vashte Warren, O. G. Weaver, Mary B. Wormley; **Mount Holyoke College**, Marianne Brock, Marion Tait; **Mount Union College**, Glenn Clark, Erma J. McGarr, Helen L. Pease, Jack C. Webb; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney)**, James F. Harding, Harry H. Hoffman, Zellamae C. Hoffman, Dorothy Klein, Phyllis Roberts; **University of Nebraska**, Adam C. Breckenridge, Arthur G. George, Charles E. Miller, Martin H. Muma, W. Winfield Ray; **University of Nevada**, Joseph H. Robertson; **New England Conservatory of Music**, Albert Tepper; **University of New Hampshire**, George Bennett, Myra L. Davis, Donald E. Dunn, Reeshon Feuer, Arthur S. Harris, Jr., A. Raymond Harvey, Wallace E. McIntyre, Charles M. Matthews, Helen J. Purinton, Carl J. Schneider, Joseph Seiberlick, Leo Stoller, John Stubbe, John C. Tonkin, Laurance E. Webber, James Williamson; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Jersey City)**, Catharine M. Bergen, Christopher D. Rafter, Hedwig Trepkus; **Eastern New Mexico College**, Ruth A. Wheeler; **New Mexico State College**, Alvin D. Boston, Simon F. Kropp, Joseph S. Moran, Virginia M. D. Reese; **New Mexico Military Institute**, Modene D. Bates, Alfred N. Carter, Harold T. Kelly, George M. Sayre; **University of New Mexico**, James L. Ellis, Lez L. Haas, George Robert, Robert E. Street, D. R. W. Wager-Smith; **Associated Colleges of Upper New York (Champlain College)**, Swart L. Evans, Walter W. Jamison, George P. Rosenberg-de la Marre, Joseph Vinci; **(Mohawk College)**, Julius Cohn; **(Sampson College)**, Helena I. T. Bailie, Oran T. Casebeer, Paul T. Erickson, Thomas H. Giberson, John Hannan, Esther Hendricks, Margaret Lewis, Stephen J. Petrouits, James R. Robinson, Jr.; **New York Medical College**, Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospitals, Max M. Stettner; **New York State College for Teachers (Albany)**, Anna E. Love; **New York State Teachers College (Oswego)**, Marjorie Culver, Robert L. Larkin, Morton J. Zerder; **New York University**, G. Derwood Baker, W. Leslie Barnette, Jr., Florence N. Beaman, Oser Butterman, George R. Cervený, J. Sanford Davis, Ormond Drake, Mortimer Feinberg, Oscar Haskell, Roy E. Langfitt, Dorothy Mulgrave, Milton K. Munitz, Henry W. Mustermann, Blanche Obermaier, Ralph G. Ross, Ruth Stokesberry, Glenn S. Thompson, Elwood J. Winters; **North Carolina College at Durham**, Caulbert A. Jones, Theodore R. Speigner, John L. Stewart; **North Carolina State College**, Ira L. Baker, Jehu D. Paulson; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Albert W. Anderson, Joel W. Broberg, Reece L. Bryant, Burton N. Elam, Dwain Ervin, Robert O. Kelley, Andre J. Lejeune, Cyril C. Moore, Wendell W. Norris, Enoch B. Norum, Richard L. Post, Kermit F. Schlamb, Albert E. Weyer; **North Dakota State Teachers College (Minot)**, C. Sidney Bjorlie, Mary E. Macchi, Irene H. Wood; **University of North Dakota**, Encel H. Dodge, Andrew J. Kochman, Jr., E. Raymond Peterson, William P. Pierce, Ernest V. Wenner; **Northwestern University**, William L. Cary, Frank J. Dudek, Faye W. Grant, Harold E. Heath, Donald B. Lindsley, E. Clifford Toren; **Norwich University**, John J. Santosuosso; **University of Notre Dame**, Nicholas J. Amato, E. K. Francis, John A. Jump, Richard L. Kilmer, Robert D. Nuner; **Ohio State University**, James

H. Healey, Leland B. Jacobs, Richard A. Popham, Alva M. Tuttle; **Ohio University**, Marguerite Appel, Laurence V. Calvin, Lillian Clark, Victor Goedicke, Claude E. Kantner, Phillip McVey, Edgar J. Moore, Carl H. Roberts, Helen R. Smith, Merl W. Tillson; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, Hubert Bonner, Eugene Clark, Mylen E. Fitzwater, Virginia C. Northrop, Elizabeth J. Peterson, Robert H. Ross, Jr., Thelma Thompson, Arlene Young; **University of Oklahoma**, Leo M. Hurley, Charles E. McKinney, G. Raymond Stone, E. Staten Wynne; **University of Omaha**, Alvin H. Goesser, James D. Tyson; **Oregon College of Education**, Louis Kaplan; **Southern Oregon College of Education**, Edith L. Bork, Helen I. White; **Pacific University**, Victor J. Bachman, James R. Carley, Gertrude B. Crane, Earl A. Dvorak, Myrtle Fern, William H. Genné, Richard A. Greenfield, Albert C. Hingston, Roberto M. Hooker, Detleff T. Jans, Esther Merriam, Henry F. Price, Harvey J. Roloff, Harold Schimke, Julia T. Shick, Paul Staggs, Edna V. Tarr, George B. Williston, Beatrice Young; **Pennsylvania State College**, Herbert W. Allison, Charles H. Brown, Robert E. Clark, Mary L. Dodds, Howard T. Grendon, Richard N. Krogh, Paul J. Lamorgia, L. Larry Leonard, W. Cameron Meyers, Thomas W. Minkus, Philip K. Roos, Roger B. Saylor, Ross P. Schlabach, Jr., Kenneth C. Schubel, John F. Taylor, Jack G. Zubrod; **University of Pennsylvania**, Robert Hachenburg, M. G. Sevag, Norman B. Spector; **Pikeville Junior College**, Franklin Day, Harral D. Reno; **University of Pittsburgh**, Robert Baum, Joseph Bigos, Robert Bonn, L. Ray Brant, Fred A. Dewey, Bela Gold, George R. Hackenberg, Robert W. Hart, George V. Peck, Wesley M. Rohrer, Jr., James T. Sheep, Richard C. Snyder, Glenna G. Walter, Arthur A. Weigle, Kuo Tsung Yu; **Pomona College**, Leo G. Clarke; **University of Puerto Rico**, Benjamin Baker; **College of Puget Sound**, Hugh J. Tudor; **Purdue University**, Rilma O. Buckman, Charles C. Cowell, L. Wayne Johnson, Ludwig Kruhe, George R. Mayhill, Emanuel Salgaller, Nell White, Elizabeth K. Wilson; **Queens College (New York)**, Frederick F. Fales; **University of Redlands**, E. Charles Parke, Jr., William R. Parker; **Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute**, Robert Fleischer; **Rhode Island State College**, Herbert G. Allbritten, Mary J. Bacon, Thelma Ballirano, William M. H. Beck, J. Edward Casey, Albert W. Feldman, Ernest B. Goodwin, Mark H. Gordon, Robert C. Haire, Helen H. Johnson, Douglas L. Kraus, Tamlin K. Lindsay, Marilyn C. Morgan, Thomas F. Moschetto, Barbara M. Obrien, Madeline D. Parker, Nancy A. J. Potter, Harold Sternbach, Leslie R. Stone; **Roosevelt College**, Kathryn S. Bilterman, Frances M. Breit, Dalai Brenes, Vineta Colby, Robert C. Cosbey, Estelle A. DeLacy, Victor H. Dropkin, Gustav Dunkelberger, David C. Faegre, Rexie S. Gill, Joseph Hackman, Richard J. Hooker, Frances R. Horwich, Abba P. Lerner, Benedict Mayers, Alfred E. Partridge, G. Nick Paster, Robert Runo, Harry B. Sell, Barbara Seybold, Annabel Steinhorn, Argyle Stoute, Ella H. Weaver, Rolf A. Weil, Margaret F. Williams, Otto Wirth, **Russell Sage College**, G. Elwood Jones, Jr., Otilie H. Rollins, Marion Teter, Ruth C. Tuller; **Rutgers University**, Richard P. Adams, Robert M. Adams, Robert J. Alexander, José V. Amaral,

William P. Baker, Roderick A. Barnes, Monroe Berkowitz, Gerald A. Bertin, Walter E. Bezanson, Leonard R. Criminale, Ralph J. DeFalco, Herbert Dern, Robert R. Dockson, Joseph R. Feldmeier, John M. Hall, Horace E. Hamilton, Curtis L. Hemenway, Judd D. Hubert, Harold M. Kaplan, Alfred L. Kellogg, Leopold Kohr, Norman H. Leonard, Jr., Martin Lichterman, Frederick Lustig, Joseph Maier, Remigio U. Pane, Aaron S. Polinsky, Richard L. Predmore, Chester I. Randles, Jay Rumney, Samuel Saben, Bernard Serin, Joseph M. Shumaker, Sidney I. Simon, Edward L. Simons, Israel S. Stamm, James L. Stewart, Gilbert Sutherland, Richard T. Weidner, Peter R. Weiss, Henry R. Winkler; **St. Francis Xavier College for Women**, James E. McKeown; **St. John's University**, Felix J. Guigon, Harold Kleinsinger, Emil P. Kloeckner, Anthony J. Kondé, Hugh J. Luongo, Anthony J. MonteBovi, Paul F. Nace, Herbert C. Raubenheimer, C. Carl Robusto, Hugh J. Tallon, Valentine Williams; **St. Lawrence University**, William E. Felch, James T. Hicks, Philip D. Rossi; **St. Louis University**, Herbert P. Stellwagen; **College of St. Thomas**, Garold L. Bartness, Jerome Burtle, Laurens E. Bush, Leo A. Erlon, Robert P. Fogerty, William D. Larson, Eugene J. McCarthy, George V. Martin, Arthur G. Montgomery, Joseph M. Reuber, D. Heinrich Rommen, G. W. C. Ross, Lawrence V. Ryan, J. Herman Schauinger, Frederick J. Semmler, Laurence W. Sheridan, Herbert Slusser, William J. Tomsicek, David R. Watkins, Herbert M. Willging; **Salem College**, Roy J. Campbell; **Sam Houston State Teachers College**, Jacob Lechner; **City College of San Francisco**, Alfred P. Agosti, Margaret B. Ancker, James L. Billwiller, Grace M. Brown, William E. Bush, W. Madison Devlin, Samuel E. Duff, Alfred E. Edstrom, Miriam G. Escher, David G. Everall, John H. Fawcett, Frank W. Fermer, Walter D. Forbes, Jules Fraden, Thomas A. Gabbert, Ruth E. Gavin, George Gould, Ralph T. Granneberg, George L. Green, Michael J. Griffin, Phylis Haley, W. Rollin Hanson, James S. Hughes, George F. Hutchins, Fred Kelly, Hulme H. Kinkade, Edward W. Larson, Dorothy H. Luckhardt, Gladys Luhman, Luther H. Lyon, Jessie P. McCarthy, Charles H. McKiernan, F. Grant Marsh, William C. Marsh, Eugene Mead, Dorothy F. Mercer, Eric Moeller, Michael M. Monaco, Manfred E. Mueller, Ella B. Nowell, Bev J. Pasqualetti, Elmer Patterson, Jr., Helen Reveal, James H. Ripley, William A. Roecker, John E. Ross, William H. Schoon, Jane Scribner, Lloyd Sisler, Clement S. Skrabak, Llewellyn R. Snyder, John R. Stafford, Adolph G. Stoll, Gloria E. Swicegood, Stephen J. Tomer, Robert P. Utter, Verrel A. Weber, Michael M. Zarchin; **San Francisco State College**, Alice P. Allcutt, Leo F. Cain, George R. Feliz, Karl Kasten, Henry C. Lindgren, J. Fenton McKenna, Asael B. Murphy, George B. Stenberg, Robert S. Stewart, Louis Wasserman; **San Jose State College**, Ezekiel Bogosian, William J. Erlendson, Gladys G. Gibson, Lawrence H. Mouat, Milburn D. Wright; **University of Scranton**, Edward J. Burke, Umbay H. Burti, Frank A. Cimini, James A. Driscoll, Elmer M. Kruper, Lawrence J. Lennon, John P. McLean, Thomas G. Murray, Joseph P. Neary, Andrew W. Plonsky; **Scripps College**, Lee Pattison, Marion Stewart; **Colleges of the Seneca**, Abigail M. Mosey; **Seton**

Hall College, Edward J. Henry, William A. Henry, Karl T. Ohl, Joseph G. Sharkey, Stanley Strand; **University of South Carolina**, Harry W. Davis, Nelle Douglas, Don A. Galgano, A. L. Geisenheimer, William E. Hoy, Lawrence A. Kratz, Irene T. LaBrode, Viana B. McCown, William H. Patterson, Ellen Rasor, L. Vernon Robinson, Alfred G. Smith, Jr., H. Frank Trotter, Robert L. Van Doren, William W. Weber; **University of South Dakota**, William H. Gauger, Esther Howard, Claude J. Whitlow; **University of Southern California**, Solly Bernick, Carl Devine, Howard F. Eckes, Maurice Nelles, Bernard Z. Rabinowitch, G. Robert Rogers, Richard Slobodin, John F. Svoboda, Robert W. Thompson; **Southern Methodist University**, Harvey L. Davis, T. Herbert Etzler, Wilmer Masterson, A. J. Thomas, Jr.; **Springfield College**, Archie P. Allen, Elmer H. Allen, Harold Amos, Fred G. Bratton, Victor P. Dauer, Leon Doleva, Arthur A. Esslinger, F. Edgar Hubbard, A. Peter LoMaglio, F. B. Rainsberry, Clayton T. Shay, Jr., Charles E. Silvia, Walter G. Stewart, Vina E. Walz, Marjorie A. C. Young; **Stanford University**, Georges E. Lemaitre; **Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College**, William S. Cannon, Elizabeth M. Hunt; **Stephens College**, Charles Avery, Helen H. Balk, William C. Cragin, Albert J. Delmez, Katharine P. Durrett, W. Clark Ellzey, Russel H. Fowler, Charlotte Georgi, Ruth B. GoodSmith, Arnold D. Graeffe, Madeleine K. Grapes, Peter S. Hansen, Janice A. Janes, J. Harvey Littrell, Hugh McCammon, Farris Mansour, Dorothy G. Park, Thomas N. Putnam II, James G. Ranck, Elisabeth Recht, John F. Rios, Cynthia Roubesh, Zay R. Sullens, John H. Thompson, Madelaine M. Touchstone, Barbara Twyeffort, Edith F. Whitmer, Frances M. Wilson; **Syracuse University**, Robert O. Bloomer, William L. Claff, Reginald A. Kenney, Hibberd V. B. Kline, Jr., Francis A. Loiero, Ethel M. McLean, Martha Pitel, Charles J. Reitemeyer, Audrey I. Richards, Arthur H. Rosien, John R. Whitaker; **Temple University**, William M. Polishook, Murray Wax; **Middle Tennessee State College**, Buleah Davis; **University of Tennessee**, Catherine L. Allen, Ida A. Anders, Ruth Buckley, Ella J. Day, Mary L. Jacobsen, Florence L. MacLeod, Elise Morrell, Hazel Rainbolt, William C. Smith, Elisabeth L. Speer, Dorothy Stockburger, Helen Thomas, Martha Watkins, M. Virginia Wilson, Lillian Worley; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, Robert V. Andrews, Edwin C. Cass, Emil F. Hubka, Jr., Wayne E. Long, Joe T. Meador, Virgil B. Robinson, William L. Russell, James N. Shepperd, Morris E. Tittle, Vernon A. Young; **Texas College of Arts and Industries**, H. N. Clarkson, L. F. Connell, Fred M. Garland, William H. Leckie; **Texas State College for Women**, Mary A. Mason, Leone Orner, Coreen M. Spellman, Claude B. Tate; **East Texas State Teachers College**, Graham Johnson; **North Texas State Teachers College**, Eli P. Cox, Jr., Artie A. Daniel, Joe H. Farmer, Howard C. Key, Elizabeth Lomax, Valerie B. Mangum, Grady L. Mullennix; **University of Texas**, Ruth Abernathy, Corrie W. Allen, Richard H. Ballinger, Elizabeth Bodenstein, Thelma A. Bollman, Mary Buice, Norma D. Bunton, Thomas N. Campbell, D. Mason Clark, Erie M. Darnall, Norris G. Davis, William H. Earhart, Austin Foster, Evelyn M. Foster, Allen Z. Gammage, William B.

Gardner, Ernest F. Haden, D. Lee Hamilton, Wheeler Hawley, Arthur R. Hayes, Henry M. Hoenigswald, Arno J. Jewett, Siegfried Kuttner, Benjamin Levy, Katherine McLennan Love, Donald W. McCavick, Vera L. Moore, Jym Motheral, Clark E. Myers, Roger C. Osborn, Martha P. Owre, Leigh Peck, Bruce P. Price, Mary J. Robb, Harris L. Russell, George I. Sánchez, George Schulz-Behrend, Ernest A. Sharpe, W. Powell Stewart, Burnett F. Treat, Richard W. Tyler, Charles M. Vance, John A. Walter, Benjamin C. Watts, Samuel R. Wiley, John D. Williams, Erich W. Zimmermann, Jaroslav E. Zivney; **University of Toledo**, Margaret A. Erausquin, Florence B. Kemp, Gordon L. Macdonald, Edward T. Schweikardt; **Trinity College (Connecticut)**, Daniel B. Risdon; **Tufts College**, George A. Edwards, Percival S. Rice; **Tulane University**, Edward G. Ballard, Ruth E. Barry, John Biesanz, Simone de la S. Delery, Irving A. Fosberg, Doris B. Griscom, Hans B. Jonassen, John H. Stibbs, Meredith M. Temple, Alexander D. Wallace; **University of Tulsa**, Morris M. Blair, Harry A. Broadb, Paula Broadb, Milton O. Denekas, Donald E. Hayden, Tosca B. Kramer, Bradley E. Place, C. Delmar Thomas; **Union College (New York)**, Robert J. Hicks, John Iwanik; **Upsala College**, Paul E. Loven; **Ursinus College**, Charles L. Chandler, Evan S. Snyder, H. R. Vanderslice; **Vanderbilt University**, Marion M. Junkin, A. F. Kuhlman, Alexander Merchant, William H. Rowan, Walter H. Storer; **Vassar College**, John A. Christie; **University of Vermont**, Betty Bandel, James H. Turner; **Virginia Polytechnic Institute**, John M. Moore, Evans G. Thompson; **Washburn Municipal University**, Morris L. Bigge; **Central Washington College of Education**, Harold Barto, Herbert R. Bird, A. Bert Christianson, Robert G. Fisk, Robert S. Funderburk, R. Arthur Hall, Carl G. Johnson, Shelton D. Kem, Barbara E. Kohler, Shirley Nelson, Linwood E. Reynolds, Jean Swanson, Annette Walker; **Western Washington College of Education**, Donald P. Irish, Glenn D. Warrick; **Washington and Jefferson College**, Fred V. Hartenstein, Minor Hawk, George B. Hurff, Antonio W. Moreno; **Washington University**, Jules Henry, Horst W. Janson, Oscar Lewis, Arnold M. Rose; **University of Washington**, Ruth M. Alliger, Sylvia F. Anderson, Victoria Anderson, Harold C. Armstrong, Nelson A. Ault, Don E. Avery, Jack L. Bangs, Paul Barton, L. Dorothy Bevis, Mildred Bonnell, Gladys Boughton, Howard M. Brier, Marie E. Brittin, Sholie R. Brown, Arthur M. Cannon, Kenneth M. Carr, Bruce B. Cheever, H. Davis Chipps, Tom B. Coleman, Agnes L. Colton, A. Emerson Creore, Alanson B. Davis, Merrell R. Davis, Stuart C. Dodd, Edgar M. Draper, Margaret Duckett, Margaret T. Dyer, Austin V. Eastman, Dexter M. Easton, Lester D. Ellerbrook, Warren S. Gramm, Helen Grayum, Philip G. Haddock, Philip E. Hager, Kermit O. Hanson, Albert L. Hoag, George L. Hoard, Jean P. Keller, Joan R. Klima, Norman F. Kunde, Stuart Lippincott, Florence McKinlay, Donald C. McNeese, Thomas W. Macartney, Sara N. Mark, Mary L. Mason, Ralph M. Murphy, Marian H. Pettibone, Winton Pettibone, Drury A. Pifer, Carl A. Pitt, Roscoe LeR. Pullen, Donald G. Radcliffe, Walter Ricker, L. Wait Rising, Viola K. Rivenburgh, Paul J. Rust, Caroline G. Smid, Stevenson Smith,

James M. Starr, Carlisle H. Thompson, Frank M. Warner, Margaret Warning, Arthur H. Whiteley, Clotilde Wilson, Richard R. Woodward, Lawrence J. Zillman; **Wayne University**, John F. Ebelke, Robert V. Fay, Irving Massey, Maurice M. Ramsey; **Wellesley College**, Mary J. Donahue, Teresa C. Frisch; **Wesleyan University**, S. Jay Savereid; **West Virginia State College**, Mary Ann W. Avent, Carrie E. Brady, Mabel M. Dillard, Naomi M. Garrett, Sophia P. Nelson, P. Ahmed Williams; **West Virginia University**, Evelyn Anderson, John D. Carter, Clyde English, F. Herrera y Sánchez, Armand E. Singer, Marion A. Wharton; **Western College**, Joan Corbett, Ora B. Dabney, Mildred B. Munday, Fred K. Scheibe; **Western Reserve University**, Ruth Evans, Margene O. Faddis, Charles Rehor, Anthony L. Sancetta; **Wheaton College (Massachusetts)**, Margaret I. Conway; **Whitman College**, Jonathan R. Cunningham; **University of Wichita**, Robert W. Cooke, Luther L. Lyon, James W. Trimble; **Wilkes College**, Amy MacMaster; **College of William and Mary**, Merle K. Miller, John B. Morrice, Ruth F. Morrice, Verba M. Wood; **College of William and Mary (Norfolk Division)**, Donald M. Urner; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (LaCrosse)**, Alice Hager; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (Milwaukee)**, Ralph M. Aderman, Ortha L. Wilner; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (River Falls)**, Adele Bloom, Helen Bozovich, Walter J. Engler, Nicholas Jadinak, Charles A. Ladd, Bohuslav J. Rozehnal; **University of Wisconsin**, Ben F. Aycock, Paul M. Fulcher, K. Fred Gillum, Donald D. Starr, John E. Thomas; **University of Wyoming**, Donald T. Beeman, Jane S. Bemis, Laszlo Borbas, Gertrude Boyd, Leonard Bristow, Eugene Cottle, Dorothy L. Crandell, Dwight D. Darland, Ernestine Ernst, Elinor Gerstle, Jessie M. Halsted, Russell I. Hammond, Richard Mahan, Marjorie J. Morse, Vincent Ostrom, Janet Ross, Nathan Schwid, Theodore P. Walstrum, Wilson J. Walshall, Jr., Clarice Whittenburg.

Transfers from Junior to Active

University of Georgia, Dorothy B. W. Davis; **Kansas State College**, Lawrence E. Dennis.

Junior

Bowling Green State University, John K. Mires; **University of Colorado**, Albert I. Oliver, Jr., Eric N. Rackham, Adolph Unruh; **Columbia University**, Marvin D. Wigginton; **Cornell University**, Howard Beebe, Philip W. Callanan; **Florida State University**, Peyton E. Richter; **University of Florida**, Burness A. Barrington, Jr., Max J. Cleveland; **Harvard University**, Michael C. Pearson; **Southern Illinois University**, Raymond H. Dey; **University of Illinois**, Ann Beck, Joseph E. Brewer, Henry Freund, Roy Gladstone; **University of Illinois (Galesburg)**, Raymond E. Carroll, Catherine A. Guffey, Evelyn Milcezny, Richard E. Robinson, Alice M. Thomas; **Iowa State College**, Robert T. Gregory, Spencer Macy; **University of Kansas**, Luther H. Buchele, Rose C. Ebener; **University of Kansas City**, John H. Hunter, Ann R. Jacobson, Richard T. Street; **University of Maryland**, Cornelius F. Mox-

ley; **University of Michigan**, Paul E. Cairns, Richard E. Clark, Robert W. Cox, John J. Dreher, Frank Fletcher, Lawrence W. Grosser, Thomas E. Hansen, James E. Humphrey, James B. Wallace; **University of New Mexico**, Helen R. Haight; **University of Southern California**, Arthur T. Tait; **Not in Accredited Institutional Connection**, A. Evangeline Tubbs (M.M., University of Illinois), Springvale, Maine.

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

To assist in the placement of college and university teachers the American Association of University Professors publishes notices of academic vacancies and of teachers available. It is optional with appointing officers and teachers to publish names and addresses or to use key numbers.

Letters in reference to announcements published under key numbers should be sent to the Association's central office for forwarding to the persons concerned. Address in care of the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1011 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Vacancies Reported

Chemistry: Vacancy in General Chemistry and Organic, alternate with General Chemistry and Physical every other year. Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis in summer. Salary nine months, Doctorate without experience, \$3375—with thirteen years' experience, \$4023. Apply to David Kirby, Dean, Concord College, Athens, West Virginia.

Psychologist, Clinical: Ph.D. required, beginning September, 1948 or later in southwestern state university. V 1261

Sociology: Assistant Professor—young man with Ph.D. and some college teaching experience. Eastern university, located in large city. Salary \$3200-3800 for nine months depending on experience. Summer session optional. V 1262

Teachers Available

Administration, Dean of Students, Applied Sociology: Man, 40, married. M.A., Yale; doctorate courses completed, New York University. 15 years' experience in college teaching, academic administrative work, community relations, social work and counseling. Military-civilian liaison work during World War II. Now assistant to administrator of advanced professional psychiatric education program in training center which must reduce staff. Seeks opportunity to return to campus life in student relations or academic administration in a university system which is interested in developing new ideas and approaches in these fields. Prefer West Coast or mountain locale, but place intellectual-social climate above physical-terrestrial. Available on reasonable notice. A 2973

Art: Experienced teacher of history of art and architecture, methods of teaching art, and studio classes in fine and applied art; incidental experience in lecturing and writing; participation in art museum radio program. A.B. degree with equivalent of M.A. degree in graduate work (University of Colorado, New York, Baltimore and Washington art schools). Travel in Europe, Canada, Bermuda, and extensively in this country; greatly interested in South American, Indian, and regional American art expressions. (Can teach French.) Prefer opportunity to build up new art department in progressive college or university. Experienced in all media. Salary \$4000 or \$2500 plus maintenance, school year. Available immediately. A 2974

Biology (Zoology, Animal Ecology, Comparative Anatomy): Man. B.S. and S.M. with advance graduate training and research. 28 years' teaching experience in college Biology. Seeks temporary position, full or part-time, for second semester. Desires access to good library for further research and writing. A 2975

Botany: Man, 40, married, children. Ph.D. and M.A. from leading university. 14 years' experience in Teachers College and State University teaching Botany, Plant Pathology and Mycology, General Biology and Zoology. Now Professor of Botany and Head of the Botany Department and Chairman of the Science Division in State University Branch. Previous experience, Professor and Head of Department of Biology in State Teachers College. Desire to establish permanently in a strong college. Publications and professional societies. Minimum salary \$4000. Available September, 1948. A 2976

Business Administration and Economics: Associate Professor, Ph.D., age 36. Seeks professorship or head of department. Has taught economic history of the U.S., introduction to business, marketing, advertising, salesmanship, transportation, and allied subjects. Available September, 1948. A 2977

Civil Engineering (Structural Engineering): Young family man. Registered structural engineer; member of American Concrete Institute, American Society of Civil Engineers, and other professional organizations. Practical, research, college, and university experience. Now teaching structures as associate professor in state college. Invites correspondence regarding position as professor or associate professor of structural engineering in a department of civil engineering beginning preferably September, 1948 or 1949. A 2978

economics (Economic Philosophy, Economic Theory, History of Economic Thought, Social Control of Industry, Industrial and Labor Relations, Public Utility Regulation, and Transportation): Man, 45, married. A.B., LL.B., and M.A., and near doctorate. 24 years' successful teaching experience, 9 years' at university level. Also experience in teaching Political Science, Law, and Philosophy. Member of the Bar. Publications. Research for State. Now associate professor in a state university. Prefer position in or near large and reputable university where work on doctorate can be completed. Available fall term, 1948. A 2979

Economics and Political Science (International Relations, History of Institutions and Thought, Geography, Land Economics): Man, 45 years old. Ph.D., Heidelberg, former Rockefeller Fellow. Four books, numerous articles; 10 years' teaching experience in Eastern state universities, including Principles of Economics. A 2980

English: Man, 28, single. M.A., Phi Delta Kappa, NCTE. Former chairman of English and French departments. Now dean in temporary accredited junior college. Seeking permanent position in teaching and/or administration. Available September, 1948. A 2981

English: Man, 33, single. M.A., Yale. Working on doctoral dissertation. Especially interested in Freshman and Sophomore composition. Experience as instructor at liberal arts college and as headmaster of private school. Desires assistant professorship. Available January, 1949. A 2982

English: Man, 40, married, 2 children. Ph.D., wide experience, varied publications. Special field, American literature. Special interest, Great Books. A 2983

English and Humanities (Engineering or Liberal Arts students): Man, 44, married, 2 children. B.S. in Engineering, M.A. in English, Ph.D. in English and Comparative Literature. Associate professor of English and Humanities, and administrator in large institution at \$6000. 22 years' teaching and administrative experience. English Literature, Electives, Great Books, World Literature Particularly qualified to head Social Science-Humanities Division in large engineering school. Widely travelled. Scholarship, research fellowship, honors.

- Publications. Who's Who. Outstanding references. Desires full professorship and/or administrative position at \$7500. Available September, 1948. A 2984
- English Literature: Man, 51, married. A.M., Harvard; Ph.D., Columbia. Has taught in colleges and universities on both coasts. Now in eighteenth year at prominent eastern liberal arts college. Recent book in field of Stuart drama. Special interests: Shakespeare, English and modern drama, English novel, literature of the English renaissance, Milton. Children grown up. Free to go west again. Desires full professorship in California college or university; would consider Colorado, Oregon, Washington. Wife, with long college theatre experience, now director of college theatre; might consider staff position. Available summer or fall, 1949. A 2985
- Fine Arts, Humanities, Social Science: Man, 39, married, 2 children. Ph.D. in Art History and Art Education. 9 years' college teaching, 4 years' high-school teaching. 3 years, private industry, art director. Present position: Art lecturer and teacher of Literature and Philosophy in an integrated Humanities Course of large university. Desires position in eastern or mid-western college as teacher of Art History, head of Fine Arts department, or chairman of integrated Humanities Course. Also interested in position teaching Social Science along with Art History. Writer and lecturer on Art. Available summer, 1948. A 2986
- French, Latin, English Literature: Man, 24. B.A. Presently working on M.A. thesis; brief teaching experience, ready to accept position with modicum of pay, in return for additional experience. A 2987
- French (Spanish): Veteran, 42, children. Professional diplomas and Doctorate (Paris). European Fellowship and travel; publications; now head of modern language department. Salary expectancy: \$6000. Available after June, 1948. Eastern location preferred. A 2988
- French and Spanish: American woman, M.A. European training, extensive foreign residence and travel in Europe and Latin America. Language and area knowledge wide and fluent. Experience, college and university levels. Student foreign travel director, and U. S. Foreign Service as Diplomatic wife. Husband retired, engaged in research. Desires position in one of the three professorial ranks, preferably on West Coast, salary and exact location open. A 2989
- French and Spanish: Woman, Ph.D. Excellent experience in college teaching and management of a department. Now employed in a fully accredited institution. Two research fellowships. Interested in a better position. A 3011
- French, Spanish, German minor: Radcliffe M.A., Ph.D. candidate. 7 years Europe, 6 college teaching. A 2990
- German: Doctorate from University of Vienna, Austria. 18 years' university teaching in the U. S., all undergraduate courses in German language and literature. Since 16 years with a college in the East, head of department, publications, texts, multigraphed teaching material, progressive methods, desires change to liberal arts college. Teaches also courses in Economics. A 2991
- German, French: Woman. Swiss. A.M. in German; Ph.D. in French; author of Introduction to German (in Heidelberg), desires position in liberal arts college for 2 or 3 years during teachers' shortage. A 2992
- History: Man, 30, Protestant. M.A., 1948, Indiana University. 3 years' teaching experience in high school. Wants position in junior college, college, or university level, with minimum salary of \$3000. Specialties are American and European history; minors in economics and government. Available September, 1948. A 2993
- History: Man, 38, married, 2 children. Ph.D. 14 years' college and university teaching experience. Teaching fields: American, English, European since 1789,

- Civilization survey, and economic history. Research in American Revolutionary period. Now professor of history and chairman of social sciences in temporary veterans' division of state university. Available September, 1948. A 2994
- International Education: 38 years old. Ph.D. (English), Ohio State University, 1935. Seeks a challenging opportunity in international education as coordinator of college-community program for foreign students or as educational director for a national or international organization. 6 years of college teaching and 7 years of administrative work (3 in counselling and guidance) in higher education. Last salary over \$9000 per year. Work experience with the following racial, religious, cultural, national, and minority groups in the U. S. and overseas: Catholics, women, Anglo- and French-Canadians, Negroes, Mexicans, Japanese, Jews, Koreans. Numerous publications in educational journals and membership in professional associations. Broad public and radio experience. A 2995
- Law, general, also international and comparative: Man, 43, married. Native of New York State. J.D., University of Vienna. Practiced law abroad and in U. S. Several years with Federal government as attorney. Now full-time professor of law in approved law school, teaching Equity and common-law subjects. Publications. A 2996
- Law, or Pre-Legal Subjects: Man in middle life, married. Graduate LL.B. Member of three bars, 20 years in legal practice and legal research. Formerly an instructor and principal in high schools. Seeks connection with a college or private institution. A 3009
- Librarian: Man, interested in "teaching through books" seeks position as librarian in accredited junior or senior college where that interest can be developed. Character of school more important than size. Degrees from three American universities. Ph.D. in subject field, University of Edinburgh. Library degree, Columbia. 10 years' teaching experience, 5 in bibliography. Now director of libraries in school of 4500. Prefer either area of equable climate or New England. A 2997
- Marketing: 30 years' experience livestock marketing, university teaching, research, and federal regulation. Retiring, active service, one of largest mid-west universities. Available half-time teaching or research, full-time consultant. A 2998
- Marriage and family life, abnormal psychology, mental hygiene, maladjustment, social psychology, clinical psychology: College professor, Ph.D., mature age, employed, is looking for a better opportunity. A 2999
- Mathematics: Man, married. Ph.D., 1948. Several years' teaching experience in a university. Has taught some graduate courses and is able to teach advanced courses in analysis and algebra. Available after June, 1948. Wants position as assistant or associate professor. A 3000
- Mathematics: Man, 34, married, 1 child. Ph.D., 1940. Continuous college and university teaching experience since 1935. Now employed as mathematician in industry. Desires position as assistant professor in large university or associate professor in strong, non-sectarian liberal arts college. Prefer middle-west location. Available fall, 1948. A 3010
- Music: Man, 30, married. B.M. and M.M. in Violin, University of Michigan. Several years' teaching experience in western university as symphony conductor, instructor in violin, chamber music, conducting, orchestration. Interested in position as orchestra conductor, teacher of violin and ensemble. Excellent recommendations. A 3001
- Political Science: Man, 33, married, 1 child; 7 years' teaching experience supplemented by an equal amount of federal administrative experience; has taught: American Government, Political Theory and Public Administration; presently teaching in a University outside of the country; desires to return to the States in either teaching or administrative work. A 3013

Psychologist: College professor, A.A.A.S., A.A.U.P., American citizen, American and European experience, European background, resident of America since 1938, wants to become associated with physician, or hospital. No psychometrics, but sociology. Publications in social psychology, pedagogics. Fluent knowledge of some languages. Best recommendations. Some lecturing (at least) is desirable.

A 3002

Psychologist: Man, 39, Ph.D., Married, 2 children. 10 years' broad teaching experience. Active research record in experimental and statistical fields. Text-book just published. At present head of small department. Desires change this year or next.

A 3012

Psychologist: Man, 41, married, 2 children. Ph.D. 10 years' university teaching, emphasis in applied psychology; business experience.

A 3003

Social Science, Education, History and Philosophy of: Negro man, age 38, married, 2 children. Ph.D., 1941 from outstanding mid-western university. 10 years' collegiate teaching, educational philosophy, psychology, social sciences. Research, limited publications, excellent references, memberships in several learned and social organizations. Experienced as chairman of humanities. Available September, 1948.

A 3004

Sociology: Man, 45, married. Ph.D. 11 years' college teaching experience. At present chairman of sociology in a state university. Interested in position that will allow some time for research.

A 3005

Spanish: Woman. Seeks Assistant Professorship in liberal arts college, preferably in South. Extensive training and teaching experience. Subjects: conversation, composition, literature.

A 3006

Speech Therapy: Man, 26, married, 1 child. M.A., scholarships, assistantships, fellowship, honors. Interested in clinical work with speech problems, teaching courses in speech rehabilitation. Prefers West Coast, East, Midwest. Available September.

A 3007

Zoology, Biology: Man, married, 36. Ph.D. 6 years' teaching experience, 4 years' research experience. Several publications. Can teach general biology and most subjects in zoology, but specializing in invertebrate subjects. Desires position in university or college as professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. Available fall, 1948.

A 3008

Subscribe to—

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

Because:

- America today should be well informed about the fastest growing phase of education
- It is the only national periodical devoted to the junior college movement
- It is edited by one of America's most distinguished educators, Dr. Leonard V. Koos
- The live, forward looking program of research and service is published in the JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL

Subscription price, \$3.50 a year

1201 Nineteenth Street, N. W.

Washington 6, D. C.



ANNOUNCES TO CHAPTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS—

A new plan, Collective Level Insurance, covering groups of college staff members. Individual term life insurance policies providing fixed protection to age 70 are issued to each participant without medical examination; the low premiums may be shared by the college and the participant, or paid entirely by the college.

TIAA will supply chapters, special committees, or individuals with full information on these plans.

Your chapter of the American Association of University Professors may be instrumental in your college's study of life insurance and retirement plans.

TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

522 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK 18, N. Y.